

# THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the DEAN OF WINCHESTER, THE DEANERY, WINCHESTER, to whom  
all editorial matters should be addressed.

---

Vol. XXVII

NOVEMBER, 1933

No. 161

---

## EDITORIAL

*Church and People, 1789-1889*,\* is the title of a book by the Master of the Temple which takes rank among the standard books on the history and Church history of the nineteenth century. We say "history and Church history"; for its modest sub-title, "A History of the Church of England from William Wilberforce to 'Lux Mundi,'" scarcely does justice to the wide historical field which Mr. Carpenter has covered or to the variety of events and movements in the national life which he rightly regards as relevant to his main theme. The truth is that in this country history and Church history can rarely be separated: if they can be sometimes, as perhaps in the eighteenth century, it is because the Church has lost its faith and vision. But Mr. Carpenter is treating of a period when the Church throbbed with the vitality of great men and great movements, Evangelical, Liberal, and Catholic; and all of them left a profound and beneficent mark on the history of their times. We shall be publishing next month a review of the book by the Rev. J. W. C. Wand, Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. Meanwhile, we commend the book warmly to our readers, and not least because its author is succeeding to the Editorship of this Journal. They will find themselves, as they read, making friends with him at once.

*Values of the Incarnation*† is the title under which the Moorhouse Lectures for 1931, given by the Rev. P. A. Micklem, D.D., Rector of St. James's, Sydney, N.S.W., are published. The book is a model of concise statement, and gathers together into compact form a number of considerations from different fields of study and thought which have been exercising the minds of Christian people in recent years. After insisting in his first lecture on the Hebraic background of Christian revelation, Dr. Micklem comes to the New Testament doctrine of Christ as the product of Christian experience in the early Church—witness especially St. Paul and St. John—mediated and controlled by the history of which the Gospels are the record. For

\* S.P.C.K., 1933, 10s. 6d. net.

† S.P.C.K., 1932, pp. 160.



the interpretation of the doctrine today he makes full use of Fr. Thornton's *The Incarnate Lord*, and it is a great gain to have that fine and comprehensive work summarized as it is here. The remaining three chapters are concerned with the application of the doctrine, which is conceived on broad and clear lines. The Church's rejection of gnostic dualism in the second century represented a fundamental truth of the Incarnation; and the Church is constrained by this central affirmation of her faith to interest herself in every side of human life and seek to bring it into subjection to Christ. The Reformation represented a just revolt against the methods adopted to this end and the way in which the end itself was conceived: but the time has come for the balance to be redressed. This is especially so in the moral sphere, for only in the Incarnation is to be found that transcendent principle of unity and that effective grace which can shape man's ethical life into order. In the final lecture Dr. Micklem dwells on the special function of Anglicanism in this regard. It has shown itself hitherto able to a unique degree to provide a centre for the unity of civilization and culture; and its future destiny lies along the same lines. This brief *résumé* of Dr. Micklem's work is all too brief; but if it sends our readers to the original, they will not be disappointed.

Dr. A. C. McGiffert's *A History of Christian Thought*\* is in its own way something of a *tour de force*; and the second volume, which was published recently, covering "The West from Tertullian to Erasmus," is fully up to the level of the first. It is the kind of book which Americans do very well; their distance and their technique in writing enabling them to present a vivid bird's-eye view, where the German would be too encyclopædic and the Englishman too cautious. Not that Dr. McGiffert is not both learned and sober: but he carries these qualities with an ease and a grace which delight and absorb the reader. Naturally, a summary of this kind is no substitute for the study of the originals: but it is an admirable introduction to such study, and the author has a rare power of getting at the point of each thinker whom he discusses. His treatment of St. Augustine, of the Victorines, and of Erasmus seems to us particularly happy. There are times when we feel that a problem is dismissed too lightly, or a judgment passed without sufficient justice being done to the historical circumstances: but those who read this book will find the course of Christian thought throughout a long and tangled period described with refreshing vigour and candour, and from a point of view which is all the more instructive because it is independent.

\* *A History of Christian Thought*, vol. ii. By A. C. McGiffert. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933. 12s. 6d. net.



## GERMAN PROTESTANTISM AND THE HITLER REGIME

THE attempt to judge or to appraise any aspect of the New Germany is for the foreign observer an unenviable task. A young English theological student who has had the good fortune to have lived in Germany through five of the most critical months of this year may have, however, some information that he should endeavour to impart. During his time in Germany the writer has sought to collect impressions and to find some way through the sequence of events, which have, indeed, taken a course which at times has been none too clear even to German theologians.

History, indeed, provides the greatest difficulties, when it is contemporary, and no one can deny that during May, June, and July of this year Germany has provided us with the commencement of a new chapter in Church History. The new constitution of the *Reichskirche* is in itself a document of fundamental importance, but it is unintelligible apart from the proclamations and manifestos of the various Church groups, and what we may almost refer to as the blasts and counterblasts in which it came to birth.

It is clear that German Protestantism is passing through a great crisis, and we may, indeed, describe the German Protestant Church as standing at the crossroads. There seem to be three main possibilities. It can stand aside from the calls made upon it by the National Socialist State and by a People which, roused from a godless atmosphere, is eager to hear the voice and heed the claims of religion; or it is possible for it, officially at any rate, to degenerate into a useful tool for an all-embracing and unscrupulous National Socialist totalitarian State. There remains, however, a third possibility, that the German Protestant Church, conscious of its divine mission and convinced that the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and His Saving Death is its deepest and most sacred obligation to the German People in these days of destiny, should enter whole-heartedly within the new order and utter its message there.

There can be no real denying that the Hitler regime offers the Protestant Church opportunities that have not been hers hitherto at any period since the War. In Point 24 of the Programme of the National Socialist Party it is declared that "the Party as such represents the standpoint of a positive Christianity without binding itself confessionally to one particular denomina-



tion.”\* It is a principal aim and object of National Socialism to show that its policies and ideals are in direct contrast to those of communism. Thus a championing of a “positive Christianity” in opposition to the “Marxian” godlessness belongs to the very essence of the new order. It would signify a complete failure to appreciate the religious foundations of National Socialism were one to regard the Nazi avowal of positive Christianity as mere political opportunism. It is the profound and sacred conviction of the average National Socialist that he is answering the Call of God when he places himself under the emblem of the Swastika and under the leadership of Adolf Hitler. That Hitler is directly sent and commissioned by God to deliver Germany is the firm belief of the majority of the people. Pfarrer Hossenfelder, the leader of the “German Christians,” expressed this feeling forcibly in a Thanksgiving Sermon which he delivered in February of this year: “God created for Himself a man, one of the millions who served in the Great War, and gave him the greatest mission of our history; that of tearing the German People away from despair and restoring to them their faith in Life.”†

Hitler himself is manifestly of the conviction that he is called by God and that his work must be carried through in obedience to the Divine Will. He feels himself responsible in God’s sight for the spiritual rebirth of the German People. There is alike deep passion and real sincerity in the type of prayer frequently introduced by him: “Almighty God, bless our weapons in days to come; be Thou as righteous as Thou ever wast; judge now whether we merit freedom. O Lord, bless our fight!”‡ Hitler states quite emphatically in *Mein Kampf*, however, that it is in no way his object to pose as a religious reformer, and he declares that anyone who fondly believes that a religious reformation can spring from political organization betrays a complete lack of knowledge of the nature of genuine religion.§

In Hitler’s writings we can find no trace of a fantastic vision of an united, undenominational national Church, but *Mein Kampf* contains more than one sharp tirade against political misuse of religion.|| Hitler is, of course, a Roman Catholic, but how strict a Catholic it is not easy to say. Anyhow, two rumours that have in the last year or so been given considerable publicity seem to have no foundation; namely, on the one hand, that Hitler as a faithful son of the Roman Church would threaten the welfare of German Protestantism, and, on the other hand, that

\* See Gottfried Feder, *Das Programm der N.S.D.A.P.*, p. 22.

† Joachim Hossenfelder, *Unser Kampf* (No. 1 of Schriftenreihe der “Deutschen Christen”), p. 22.

‡ Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf* (29th ed.), p. 715.

§ *Ibid.*, pp. 124, 125.

|| *Ibid.*, especially pp. 124-127 and 294.



he was about to quit the Roman Church and become a Protestant.

Of foremost significance, however, are the following words from Hitler's famous speech given at Potsdam on March 23: "The national Government sees in the two Christian confessions the most important factors for the preservation of our *Volkstum*. . . . Their rights shall not be assailed. . . . The fight against a materialistic view of life and for a real *Volksgemeinschaft* serves the interests of the German Nation just as much as the welfare of our Christian Faith."\* This declaration has in Christian circles been widely and gratefully referred to as "the Magna Charta of the New Church in the New Reich."

The view is widely held here in England that the forces of Christianity are being opportunely mobilized in Germany in support of National Socialism. It is not to be denied that there is at this moment a grave peril of unworthy Nazi patronage of the Church. Nevertheless, the championing of Christianity by Hitler and his followers must not be contemptuously regarded as a mere means of obtaining convenient sanction for all that is carried on in the political sphere. It might, indeed, be maintained that it would have been a sounder "business" policy for the National Socialists to have declared their movement to have been based upon godlessness, or at any rate upon some form of national idealism. But, beyond all this, there is evidence with Hitler and the majority of the National Socialists of a deep conviction that the degradation of post-war Germany is, to a great extent, due to the widespread disavowal of God and rejection of the Gospel, and that the country thus needs a thoroughly constructive and "positive" Christianity. Hitler makes a stern pronouncement in *Mein Kampf*† against the "Centrum" and other political forces for seeking to make of the Church an instrument serving party interests. Quite different, according to his view, must be the relations of Church and State in the new order. Both exist to fulfil the Will of God, who has given both to the Christian Churches and to the State particular responsibilities and duties. Consequently, the State is answerable before God for the support and protection of the Churches, so that they may be in a position freely to carry out their work.

The important fact that has emerged is that the Protestant Church is called upon to face quite a different situation from that which has engaged it during the last dozen years or so. The attitude of the "Weimar" State in contrast to the "Hitler"

\* The full text of Hitler's "Programmrede" can be conveniently read in a small book entitled *Die National-Versammlung von Potsdam*, which includes all the big speeches of March 21 and 23. *Volkstum* and *Volksgemeinschaft* must preferably be left untranslated, as we have no exact equivalents in the English language.

† *Mein Kampf*, pp. 294, 379.



State was, in Church affairs, largely one of indifference or else of aggressive opposition. The "Centrum" politician with his eyes fixed on Rome had no particular interest in the welfare of the Protestant Church, while it had to face active hostility from the "Social Democratic Association of Freethinkers,"\* and, of course, from the Bolshevist anti-God movement. More subtle during the last ten years—and, indeed, long before that—has been, however, the disintegration of "positive" Christianity which has taken place within the ranks of Protestant theologians themselves.

German Protestantism since the War has been a thoroughly split force, and this fact has probably contributed more than anything else towards its comparative impotency and its declining influence upon the mass of the people. The confused differences of opinion and the destructive forces of liberal thought bred within the simple, uncultured German Protestant bewilderment, which was only too frequently succeeded by lack of faith or careless indifference.

In the last few years there has been an embarrassingly wide field of choice for the Christian intelligenzia and those determined to keep abreast of theological issues. The Church groups and movements are too numerous all to receive a mention, but typical are *Die freie Volkskirche* under ultra-critical liberal influence, *Die Deutschkirche*, as the name suggests extremely national in character, and the various groups of Christian Socialists. The result of such party faction has only too obviously been the destruction of all real unity within the Church.

It is no exaggeration to maintain that the Church up to the present year has been fighting for its existence and has been forced to see men and women in alarming numbers severing all connection with it. The stage was rapidly being reached when avowal of Christianity meant in many circles scornful reception as a despicable hypocrite or as unenlightened and an intellectual back number. But now, with the advent of the National Socialists to power, the scene has completely changed. The State is clearly calling to the Church for its co-operation in what is so constantly referred to as "the renewal of the German People." But the summons is made to the Protestant Church with more

\* Much interesting information concerning the alarming speed of anti-religious influences in Germany is to be found in the first section of Pamphlet No. 3 of the "German Christian" Series: Martin Wagner, *Die deutschen Christen im Kampf um die innere Erneuerung des deutschen Volkes*. Pfarrer Wagner on p. 5 gives most significant figures as to the increase in membership of the "Social Democratic Association of Freethinkers," founded in 1905 with 12 members, in 1910 possessing only 39, in 1918 risen in membership to 3,000. By 1920 the numbers had increased to 59,000, in 1926 to the formidable figure of 446,000. Finally, in 1930 the Association numbered 600,000 members.



fervent intensity than to the Roman Church. The State is satisfied by settling its relations to the Roman Church by means of a formal concordat, and this state of affairs proves how little the Roman Church is prepared really to enter into the life and destiny of the People as a whole. The future of Roman Catholicism in Germany is, indeed, a vital issue, but it is not that with which the present writer is concerned.

The real gravity of the present situation is to be seen in the fact that it is now the popular thing to be a confessed Christian, and most opportune for the "lost sheep" to be returning to the fold. The fact that so many Germans are seeking to gain re-entry into the Protestant Church—not by any means all of whom are coming with the purest motives of an earnest conviction of the truth and claims of the Gospel—constitutes quite one of the most difficult and pressing questions confronting those in authority.\* The way is open for the Church to go to the People, and for the People to come to the Church. How will the Church meet this gigantic situation?

Have Hitler and the National Socialists violated their pledge of non-interference in Church matters? Is it possible to believe that the new totalitarian State will forbear from invading the holiest sanctum of the Protestant Church? These and such-like questions are in no way easy to answer, if only because what one man would class as State interference, another would condone as a necessary measure of protection or as perfectly understandable concern in that which directly affects the welfare of the People.

It may be asserted without more ado that it is not the object of the National Socialist State to let the Protestant Church stand in isolation. The Church is being called to active service "im dritten Reich." An interesting declaration of the necessarily close relationship between Church and State was made by Hitler in a short broadcast message given on the eve of the recent Evangelical Church elections.† He asserted that he was speaking exclusively as a political leader, and in no way wished to concern himself with "questions of faith, dogma, or learning. These are purely inner Church affairs. But outside of these there are problems to which the politician and leader of the People, conscious of his responsibilities, is compelled to take up

\* The problem of the *Wiedereintrittsbewegung* is already being faced in various parts of Germany, and regulations and requirements are being issued. Certain of these may be studied in an article entitled "Der Weg Zurück," which appeared in the issue of *Das Evangelische Deutschland* for May 28. See also a report of a speech by Pfarrer Themel in *Volk und Kirche* (No. 4 of Schriftenreihe der "Deutschen Christen").

† The exact words of Hitler's speech, given from Bayreuth on the evening of July 22, are to be found in *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, No. 29/30, for July 28, pp. 689, 690.



a public attitude. . . . National Socialism has continuously given assurance of its determination to place the Christian Churches under State protection. The Churches on their side cannot doubt for a moment that they stand in need of State protection, and only by means of it are they in the position to fulfil their religious mission. Yes, the Churches exact this protection from the State. The State must, however, in the reverse position, demand from the Churches that they as well from their side will contribute that share of the support which the State needs for its existence. Of decisive importance for the authorization of the existence of Church and State is the maintenance of the spiritual and physical health of mankind, for the annihilation of the latter would signify the end as well of State as of Church. For this reason the State cannot take up an attitude of indifference to contemporary religious proceedings any more than the Churches can to national and political events and changes." Of equal importance was an earlier declaration made by Dr. Rust, the new Prussian Minister for Education, in which he stated that "for Prussia at any rate there exists no cause for fear that the State might force its way into the inner life of the Church. It would not interfere even with a little finger with ecclesiastical matters with which the Church alone could deal."\*

In reply to the question as to whether these pledges have been kept in practice, it may first of all be pointed out that there is no real evidence to show that the Government has in any way directly meddled in what is usually characterized as the inner (as opposed to the official or outer) life of the Church. One will look in vain for Government decrees on matters of faith or doctrine. As regards the non-doctrinal, outward side of the Church, it is noticeable that the Government, when it has taken action, has, as a rule, sought to employ the services of the Pastor and not those of the State official.

Hitler might well have appointed Government officials to deal with the various Church crises. Of supreme importance is, of course, the appointment of Wehrkreispfarrer Müller as his plenipotentiary.† Hitler has found time among his many pressing political activities to receive Müller and discuss with him the problems of the Church. Müller, on his appointment, made the following declaration in a press interview: "I shall take care that the fight for the future of the Evangelical Church

\* This declaration was made by Dr. Rust to a gathering of representatives of the Press, and the above extract may be found quoted in Barth, *Theologische Existenz Heute* I, p. 11.

† Wehrkreispfarrer Müller was an Army Chaplain stationed at Königsberg and an active "German Christian." He has, it appears, been for some time a close personal friend of Hitler's.



shall not be conducted in the same way as the political fight. Adolf Hitler is unwilling to bring about religious warfare."\*

The appointment, or projected nomination, of Church Commissioners has aroused more criticism and disquiet perhaps than any other feature in the Church crisis. In Bavaria the very idea was straightway decisively disputed, and that proved the end of the matter, but a most serious and remarkable situation arose within the Provincial Church of Mecklenburg-Schwerin. On April 22 President Granzow, Premier of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, issued an order appointing Herr Walther Bohm of Hamburg as State Commissioner for the Church, and placing in the hands of the latter legislative, judicial, and executive power. Bohm, who seemed to regard his authority as absolute except with regard to pastoral work and the preaching of the Word, declared his intention of dissolving the various Church governing bodies. The *Oberkirchenrat* immediately despatched telegrams to Hindenburg, Hitler, and Frick, while Dr. Rendtorff, at that time Landesbischof for Mecklenburg-Schwerin, wrote in expostulation to President Granzow, asking the pertinent question as to whether the Government could hope to renew out of its own strength the life of a Church. The combined efforts of Hitler and Frick secured a settlement of the conflict, and Bohm's appointment was finally rescinded. The decisive declaration made by Hitler earned the gratitude of very many Christians. Asserting that history could show that a purely political party had never brought about a religious reformation, he wrote: "Does the Mecklenburg Government believe that it can make an exception to this unbreakable rule of history? And can the renewing of so fine and sensitive a body as a *Landeskirche* begin with an act of violence?"

Of foremost importance stands the Prussian Church strife, which can scarcely be divorced from the whole complicated *Reichsbischof*† question, a full treatment of which is quite outside the scope and purpose of this article. It must suffice for the writer to seek to point out the real, crucial issues which lay at the root of the rival candidatures of Bodelschwingh and Müller.‡

\* Müller consented to answer six questions set to him by a representative of the *Tägliche Rundschau*.

† It seems best to leave *Reichsbischof* untranslated. "State Bishop" is out of the question as a translation, and "Reich Primate" does not seem wholly satisfactory.

‡ The whole proceedings that led to the election of v. Bodelschwingh witness to a lamentable lack of clarity. Bodelschwingh was the nomination of the General Church Assembly's (*Kirchenbund*) Committee of Three. This Committee comprised Dr. Kapler, President of the *Kirchenbund*, Landesbischof Maharens of Hanover, and Studiendirektor Hesse, a representative of the Reformed Churches. These three met together with Pfarrer Müller at Loccum, and agreement was there reached as to a rough form of procedure. Views were to be heard from various quarters over Church reform and with regard to a suitable person for the office of *Reichsbischof*.



It is quite an error to regard the *Reichsbischof* dispute as that of which of the two was personally more fitted for the high office. The two Pastors, rather, stood as symbols of two diametrically opposed points of view concerning the reform, and, indeed, the position and work, of the Church. This point was specially brought out by Dr. Rendtorff,\* who characterized Bodelschwingh as "the symbol for the maintenance of the pure inwardness of evangelical faith and for the tranquil assembling of those who earnestly desired to be Christians . . ." and Müller as "the symbol of the unswerving determination to declare the Gospel to our people as they are today, the symbol for the tempestuous daring deeds of youth, for the winning over of the young men in the brown shirts." Further, Bodelschwingh could be regarded as symbol for a cautious and halting relationship to the new State, Müller as symbol of a full-hearted and close co-operation with the Government in building up the good health of the People. The "German Christians" lay great stress on the point that the essence of evangelical faith is not that of treading the safe and comfortable path, but that of pressing forward with daring, while Bodelschwingh and his supporters are essentially heirs of the German Pietists, and cannot but be characterized as seeking to escape from the harshness of the present situation.

On May 24 Müller delivered a speech over the wireless concerning the election of Bodelschwingh, in the course of which he made the following notable declarations: "The Church authorities have not heard the summons of the hour. They have not apprehended the Voice of God, which calls us through

---

and then efforts were apparently to be made to come to an agreement over the *Reichsbischof*. After that was to follow his recognition by the Government, and a solemn act of ratification on the part of the People.

This form of procedure was, in fact, dangerously vague, and there was much difference of opinion, and particularly as to when the name of the new Bishop should be publicly proclaimed, and indeed as to who exactly were to elect him. It is certain that a parliamentary system of election could never prove acceptable to the "German Christians." Bodelschwingh's candidature was accepted by the majority of the representatives of the Provincial Churches on the Assembly. Wehrkreispfarrer Müller was not taken into consultation, nor informed concerning the choice of Bodelschwingh, and only by accident did he hear the published news of the election. The "German Christians," who had semi-officially a day or two before declared their advocacy of Müller's candidature, were quite ignored in the final arrangements. There is no doubt that Bodelschwingh was legally elected according to the parliamentary system of the old order, but, as the "German Christians" were quick to point out, it was out of the question that they could approve of a *Reichsbischof* who did not possess Hitler's confidence, and who could not be proved to be the choice of the German Evangelical People. The "German Christians" as well declared it only to be feasible that the Bishop should come from out of their own ranks.

\* See an article "Konflikte in Mecklenburg-Schwerin um die Wahl D. v. Bodelschwingh," in *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, No. 23, June 9; and an article entitled "Die Christlich-deutsche Bewegung zur kirchliche Lage" in the June issue of *Glaube und Volk*, the organ of the *Christlich-deutsche Bewegung*, of which Rendtorff is leader.



the movement within our people to deeds of venture, to the renewal of our *Volkstum* from out of the depths of the Gospel. The solution which they propose to us in the question of the new Bishop is not connected with all the faith, hope, and love which is possessing the hitherto indifferent and despairing masses. The choice of the Church authorities is not the choice of the "German Christians," for it is not the choice of the present German Evangelical Church People."

Such was then the difference of view that was causing a serious rift within the Evangelical Church just when all was looking so promising in the work for union and towards the *Reichskirche*. What is more, it was not easy to see quite how the Church was going to find a way out by her own unaided efforts. At this point the State interfered, and, it may be believed, with the best of intentions; still, the whole form of procedure was most unfortunate. Dr. Rust appointed Dr. Jäger, the head of the Church department in the Prussian Ministry of Education, as State Commissioner for the United Prussian Church,\* while Jäger, in his turn, nominated a complete set of Commissioners for the local Churches, by no means all of whom were Pastors. The real effect of the State interference was to be seen, however, in the numerous new nominations to office which had the result of placing the "German Christians" in predominant control. Most important of these were the appointments of Dr. Friedrich Werner, a Berlin lawyer and prominent "German Christian," as Commissary President of the *Oberkirchenrat* of the Prussian Church, and Pfarrer Joachim Hossenfelder, the well-known leader of the whole "German Christian" movement, as Commissary clerical Vice-President of the same body.† The membership of the *Oberkirchenrat* was reconstituted, in order to provide an overwhelming majority of "German Christians." Wehrkreispfarrer Müller, with the approval of Dr. Jäger, took upon himself the direction of the Church Assembly (*Kirchenbund*), allowing himself the fullest measure of power, and he soon received the office of Bishop of the United Prussian Church.

All these changes and the work of the various Commissioners did not bring peace or unity within the Church. The result was increased unrest and dissension, and little progress was made towards the *Reichskirche*. It can best be demonstrated how lamentable affairs had become by reading through the declaration by Dr. Jäger, when he felt forced to place the Church under

\* The Prussian Church Union comprises a membership of almost twenty million.

† Pfarrer Hossenfelder is only thirty-four years old. He has now received the position of Bishop of Brandenburg.



police supervision,\* and the warning of the *Oberkirchenrat* to the Pastors of the Prussian Church against openly attacking the State or those carrying out its work.†

The decisive intervention of President Hindenburg was, indeed, necessary, before the tension of the crisis was really at all alleviated. Hindenburg had received many letters and telegrams urging him to take action, and finally on June 30 he addressed a diplomatic letter to Hitler, in which he urged him to do all in his power straight away to restore peace. The action of Hindenburg did much to quiet matters down and to curb the intrusions of the State, and the work for the new Constitution of the Church went on rapidly, being in the hands of a committee which was not exclusively composed of "German Christians." The Constitution was finally made public on July 13, and received general commendation for the care and moderation with which it had been framed.

In summary, there is no real evidence to show that the State at any time interfered directly in questions of religious faith and dogma. Still, the contention that the State has through its obvious, active support of the "German Christians" indirectly violated its solemn pledge cannot be too lightly set aside. It is doubtful whether the "German Christians" would be in their ascendant position now, but for the assistance of the State, and no one can reasonably contend that the State has left the Church alone to work out her constitutional reforms. It must be remembered, however, that the State had pledged itself to work for the establishment of a "positive" Christianity, and that the period was one of revolution, and the Hitler regime regarded itself as fighting for the Soul of the People. In such a situation it was almost impossible for the Church to be left alone to become a centre of dangerous dissatisfaction.

Attention has already been drawn to the great number of groups within the German Protestant Church, the influence of most of which is now, of course, rapidly on the decline. But we must not omit all reference to the recently founded "Young Reformers Movement"‡ (*Die Jungreformatrische Bewegung*). This movement appears to take up a halfway position with regard to the present problems of Church and State. While joyfully greeting the opportunities presented by the new religious situation, the "Young Reformers" take up a noticeably

\* See *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, No. 28, for July 14, p. 668.

† See *Das Evangelische Deutschland* for July 9.

‡ At the beginning of May the "Young Reformers" produced an *Aufruf* which carried the signature of such well-known theologians as Professor Karl Heim (Tübingen), Professor Ritter (Marburg), Professor Schreiner (Rostock), Professor Stählin (Münster), and Dr. Hanns Lilje, General Secretary of the German Student Christian Movement.



cautious attitude upon the basis of an orthodox theology. Though the movement is unlikely to make any real impression on the masses, yet it has already rendered considerable services to German Protestantism by insisting that all reformation of the Church must issue from the innermost being of the Church itself, and not be subject to injurious political influences, and by taking a firm stand against the attempted exclusion of non-Aryans from the Church.

It is becomingly increasingly plain, however, that the real power in the Church of the moment lies in the hands of the "German Christians," and this will certainly be more so still in the immediate future. The huge majorities gained everywhere in the recent Church elections by the "German Christians" were most striking. In many parishes a poll was rendered quite superfluous. It should be emphasized that the "German Christians" are not aiming at adding another party to the already bewildering list of religious movements. They are rather seeking to abolish parties, and provide one active Church "im dritten Reich."

It is difficult to speak of an exact date or act of founding of the *Glaubensbewegung Deutschen Christen*,\* for in the last few years groups of "National Socialist Christians" had sprung up in various parts of Germany,† and many Pastors, and especially Pfarrer Wieneke and Wehrkreispfarrer Müller, had made it their object to show that Christianity and National Socialism were in no true sense irreconcilable, but that the one stood in need of the other, if a full and permanent renewal and recovery of the German People were to be achieved. A landmark in the history of the "German Christians" was the establishment of headquarters in Berlin under the vigorous leadership of Pfarrer Hossenfelder. He gathered together there an able staff, each member of which was made responsible for some branch of the activities. The whole organization of the movement is most thorough and well-disciplined and bears certain definite resemblances to that of the National Socialist Party.‡

There was at the start a grave danger that the new movement would become a Church group under the control of the National Socialist Party, and the name of "Evangelical National Socialists" was freely suggested. But this dangerous move was averted by Hitler himself, who declared emphatically that

\* For a concise account of the rise of the "German Christians" see F. Wieneke, *Die Glaubensbewegung Deutschen Christen* (No. 2 of Schriftenreihe der "Deutschen Christen"), pp. 6-13.

† As, for instance, the "Arbeitsgemeinschaft evangelischer-national-sozialistischer Geistlicher."

‡ See *Volk und Kirche* (No. 4 of Schriftenreihe der "Deutschen Christen"), pp. 56-60.



the Church must lead its own life. He then suggested the name of "German Christians."\*

The "German Christians," however, first came into really full prominence through their General Congress (*Reichstagung*), held in Berlin on April 3-5 of this year, which caused a stir throughout Germany, and in which a thorough statement of their position and aims was made.

It is no easy task, however, to give in a few sentences a concise account of the aims and main ideas of the "German Christians," for, as will become quite plain later on in this article, there is by no means a standard "German Christian" theology; nor, of course, for one moment must it be supposed that every Protestant member of the National Socialist Party is of necessity a member of the "German Christians," but we can seek briefly to present the most outstanding characteristics of the Movement.

It is almost certain that we need a clear view of the position of German Protestantism from the close of the War onwards, in order to bring out to the full the "German Christian" position. Specially typical of post-war German Protestantism has been the restriction of Christianity, as it were, principally to the religious sphere. The Church has stood apart from the State and to a great extent away from the People, while the predominant stress has been laid upon the religious life of the individual or of the Church community of the Faithful. No one can deny that the Church had become distressingly out of touch with life in general. The "German Christian" Movement presents the very antithesis of the above position. The Christian Faith is made to have its application to every sphere of life, and God is not merely sought or apprehended in the so-called "religious" sphere, but He is seen actively at work in every department of life. Thus the fullest stress is laid upon the Creator God. "Marriage, Family, Race, People, State and Authority are God's creative works (*Schöpfungsordnungen*) for us, and we regard them as sacred; where the sins of Man and People have destroyed them, we seek, according to God's commandment, to restore them in their purity."† It is, of course, natural that the "German Christians" stand opposed to all markedly individualistic membership of the Church.‡ It is the belief of the "German Christians" that God has a particular mission and will for every People of the world, and that He has consequently endowed each People with certain gifts and characteristics; thus many current forms of internationalism run counter

\* Wieneke, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

† Joachim Hossenfelder, *Unser Kampf*, p. 26.

‡ "Bisher stand das ich im Mittelpunkt" was the expressive declaration made at the Berlin *Reichstagung*.



to His Will and must be resisted. Pfarrer Peter put this position most clearly in a speech delivered at the Berlin *Reichstagung*: "That I was born and brought up in body, soul, and mind as a German, is ordained by the same God, who received me through Baptism into the community of the Church. . . . Thus born of German stock, and baptized in the words of my mother-tongue, I cannot just be simply a Christian. I can only be a German Christian."\*

The "German Christian" is distressed by the estrangement that has set in between his Church and his People, both of which are equally to him the direct creation of God. For him People and Church are not mere theoretical abstractions but essentially living and concrete realities. The Church, he declares, must come to the People, and the People to the Church, and in National Socialism he clearly sees a divinely commissioned instrument to this end. The German People will, according to him, return to their Church, once they behold it fully awake and alive, joyfully recognizing and co-operating with the new State, standing as an unity, and occupying its rightful position in the very centre of national life. This feeling is notably put into words in a paragraph of the new "Authorized Instructions" (*Richtlinien*) of the Movement:

"In an unique manner through the National Revolution in our Fatherland the State has found the way to the German People and the German People has again found its way to the State. And, moreover, it appears as though the German People were seeking once again a way to the Church, conscious that the deepest source of their life and strength lies there. The German Churches, consequently, have to do all in their power to see that this can take place. For a German Church side by side with the German People is nothing but an empty institution. It can be the Christian Church within the German People only when it is the Church *for* the German People, and when it lends its assistance in selfless service to them, in order that they may be enabled to realize and fulfil the vocation that God has given to them."

It is quite erroneous to imagine that the "German Christian" wishes the Church to come under the State, or become a department of the State. We may quote the following official declaration as typical of the "German Christian" view of the proper relations of Church and State: "We have no desire for a State Church, but we also do not wish for a Church which is a State within the State. What we want is an Evangelical *Reichskirche*, which recognizes through Faith the sovereign power of the National Socialist State, and preaches the Gospel 'im

\* Pfarrer Peter in *Volk und Kirche*, p. 8.



dritten Reich.'"\* The "German Christians" are careful to assert that they definitely oppose the confusion of religion and politics, or their identification, but they desire the Church to give up its neutrality, and to support wholeheartedly Hitler's work, and it is their hope that a serious conflict between Church and State would be rendered thereby impossible. It is easy for us to doubt the harmonious working out of such ideas, and to claim that the "German Christians" are walking perilously upon a very narrow edge, but the fact is that the "German Christians" are above all adventurers.

If the Protestant Church is going to make her full contribution to the New Germany, the "German Christians" demand that she must herself undergo renewal and changes, which, indeed, bear a close resemblance to the principal alterations wrought by the political revolution. First and foremost, in place of twenty-six loosely connected local Churches there must be an United German Evangelical Church. Then, there must be one responsible leader of this united Church in the person of the *Reichsbischof*. The office of "General Superintendent" shall be discontinued, and, in future, there shall be a fully responsible Bishop at the head of each local unit.† The leading positions in the newly constituted Church must be held by men who are alive to the particular needs of the present, and who will take up a positive attitude of loyalty to the State. They must, further, be men who, conscious of God's call to leadership, can exercise authority and discipline, and command general confidence.‡ In exact parallel to that which occurred in the political sphere, the parliamentary system of Church Government must be set aside, but it is intended that the synodal system shall be maintained, though it seems likely that, in future, its members will be appointed rather than elected, since it is imperative to secure the services of men of outstanding ability. "In the synods we wish to put an end to the epoch of unfruitful discussion," was the recent declaration of Pfarrer Loerzer, a leading "German Christian."§

A survey of the main features of the "German Christian" Movement would be incomplete without reference to a book by Dr. J. B. Schairer, the leader of the Württemberg "German Christians," which bears the most disturbing title of *Volk—*

\* Article V. from "Evangelische Reichskirche nach den Grundsätzen der 'Deutschen Christen,'" issued on May 4 of this year by Pfarrer Hossenfelder.

† A full report of the important Synod of the Prussian Church held in Berlin on September 5 will be found in *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, No. 37, September 15, pp. 859-862.

‡ See the report of a speech given by Pfarrer Nobiling at the *Reichstagung*, entitled "Kirchliches Führertum," in *Volk und Kirche*, pp. 43-48.

§ See *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, No. 34, August 25, p. 796.



*Blut—Gott.* This is quite the most important systematic theological work yet produced by a "German Christian," and has certainly exercised very much influence. Schairer regards contemporary German Protestant theology as largely negative, and his criticism is, first, directed against its other-worldliness (*Jenseitigkeit*),\* characteristics of which are a disparagement of the World and its institutions and a whole concept of sin which leads to despair. In his view, however, a still more dangerous characteristic of typical modern theology is the overwhelming stress laid upon the individual,† the consequences of which he sees in Christians who make of their religion a personal matter, which is no other man's concern, and in a cult the central feature of which is the communion of the individual soul with its God. He has also naturally the sternest criticism for all forms of Christianity which tend to become sectarian.

Schairer is concerned in rescuing all that is meant by "positive Christianity," and the keyword throughout is *Gemeinschaft* (Community). God and Man alike are Social Beings, and the significance of Christian Doctrine lies in its application to the Community. God is not distant from the world nor in essential contrast to man. "God lives in the world and the world in God."‡ He can be characterized by that which converts a collection of individuals into a "People." "God is not throned in cloudy heights . . . but He works creatively in you and me, and desires to make 'neighbours' of us two. . . . He forges relationship. He fuses men together. He is, in fact, Love."§ God does not desire the "individual," but the "social man" (*Gliedmenschen*).|| Schairer does not regard sin as a personal matter, but defines it with the keyword, severance (*Sonderung*). "Sin is . . . not a legal but a purely sociological conception. For there are only sins against the community, and beyond that no other."¶ Sin as the breaking of a Law outside of us is speedily set aside as a purely Jewish view.\*\* Forgiveness of sins is characterized as "reacceptance into the Community," while Grace is viewed as "not an act between the individual soul and God, but . . . as a hearty reacceptance into the great circle, and leave to return to the Father's House."†† Faith is likewise again characterized not as a private affair between God and man, but as a Community relationship.‡‡

To Schairer it is unthinkable that anyone, even God, can exist for his own sake (*an sich*). As is to be expected, he lays the greatest possible stress upon blood, characterized as "the most separating and at the same time the most binding force

\* See Schairer, *Volk—Blut—Gott*, pp. 58-64.

† *Ibid.*, p. 107.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 141.

‡‡ *Ibid.*, p. 154.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 112.

\*\* *Ibid.*, p. 142.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 64-72.

|| *Ibid.*, p. 125.

†† *Ibid.*, pp. 150, 151.



that there is upon earth."\* Indeed, the full significance of the Incarnation is, in his opinion, first effectively realized when one sees it in the light of the mingling of Divine with human blood, while, of course, the foremost emphasis is laid upon Christ's Blood shed on Golgotha.†

No Englishman can be brought into contact with the "German Christian" Movement without sensing the dangers inherent in it. Above all, it is ominous how seldom there is in the writing and speeches of the leading "German Christians" any stress laid upon sin, repentance, and salvation, as compared with the vociferous emphasis placed upon Blood, Nation, and People. It is, indeed, precisely at this point that Karl Barth was not unnaturally impelled to write his pamphlet *Theologische Existenz Heute!* The "German Christians'" glorification of "Volk," "Nation," and "Blut" has the grave danger that God will be overshadowed or else principally conceived and worshipped in His relationship to the above realities, and it can scarcely be denied that the Reformation for which the "German Christian" is so passionately striving is at times unfortunately presented as coming from the Nation rather than from God. The "German Christians" have also been guilty of much dangerous language, and perhaps no more harmful references have been made than those to the "German God" or the "German Christ."

Further, it requires no prophet to suggest that a stern struggle may some day take place within the ranks of the "German Christians," or, indeed, of the whole German Protestant Church, between those who seek salvation from outside themselves and those who seek it from within. There runs, for instance, through Schairer's work, a particular form of idealism, that of the Nation or Race through which the Divine Power streams, and the compatibility of such precise idealism with the Evangelical Gospel may be, at any rate, questioned.

The danger is lest the "German Christians" should cultivate a narrow form of Christianity; their very name suggests the possibility of this. German Protestantism, as is well known, has in the last few years shown itself well to the fore in the support of oecumenical movements and in establishing fruitful relationships with other Churches. There is a real peril in National Socialism lest interest in the affairs of other nations be lost, and work towards international understanding be half-heartedly pursued. Professor Stählin has voiced the danger most strongly: "God's People of the New Covenant are not

\* Schairer, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

† See pp. 205-208 for the particularly interesting emphasis Schairer gives to Baptism and to Holy Communion.



bound to one race nor to one People; a Church that has ceased to think œcumenically . . . has thereby ceased to be a Christian Church."\*

In this context mention should perhaps be made also of the desire of some of the "German Christians" for the exclusion of non-Aryans (which, of course, here means mainly converted Jews) from the life of the Church. A so-called "Aryan Clause" appeared in the first official declarations of the "German Christians,"† but this was happily omitted from the new *Richtlinien*, and has also found no place in the new Constitution of the *Reichskirche*. But the fact remains that there are many among the "German Christians" who would like to see membership of the German Evangelical Church limited to those of German, or at any rate Aryan, blood, and so the question of a purely Aryan Church is not conclusively settled.‡

It should by now have become apparent that the "German Christians" by no means form an unity; at any rate, as far as theology is concerned. If there are signs that the Movement contains men who tend to stand first as Germans and then as Christians, it is equally true that there are many "German Christians" who place the Gospel altogether above People and Nation. The "German Christian" Movement was in its early days manifestly hampered by a surfeit of national enthusiasm and a serious lack of theologians within its ranks, and much crude and unfortunate theological expression was the result, as is to be seen in the first, original *Richtlinien* and in the speeches made at the *Reichstagung*. But now at the centre of the Movement are working some of Germany's best known and soundest theologians, men who are striving to give the Movement a firm grounding in the Word of God and in the genuine spirit of Luther and the Reformation. Among such men are Professor Gerhard Kittel of Tübingen, Professor Emanuel Hirsch of Göttingen, and, above all, Professor Karl Fezer of Tübingen, who was chosen as confidential representative of all the Evangelical Theological faculties of the German Universities to co-operate at Berlin both in the work of formulating the position of the "German Christians" and in that of framing the Constitution for the *Reichskirche*. Professor Fezer is perhaps the most out-

\* Professor Wilhelm Stählin (Münster) in an article "Eine heilige allgemeine christliche Kirche" in *Das Evangelische Deutschland*, June 4, 1933.

† Such as the following from Article III. of "Evangelische Reichskirche nach den Grundsätzen der 'Deutschen Christen'": "The Evangelical *Reichskirche* is the Church of the German Christians"—i.e., the Christians of Aryan race.

‡ Of importance in this connection is the "Aryan Regulation," passed in the General Synod of the Prussian Church, held in Berlin on September 5 (see *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, No. 37, September 15, p. 860). It should be pointed out that while a ruling was passed, it is true, against certain non-Aryans occupying pastoral or official positions in the Church, there was no official declaration whatsoever made excluding non-Aryans from participation in Church life.



standing pastoral theologian<sup>1</sup> in the whole of Germany, a man with a keen sense of what the German People needs from the Church at the present time, and one who is determined to see that they are given the full Gospel. He has been seconded from the University of Tübingen in order to work uninterruptedly at Berlin. It is quite impossible to estimate the full extent of his influence, but a comparison of the original *Richtlinien* with the *Neue Richtlinien* bears clear witness to his efforts, and also suggests the discussions and struggles that must have taken place behind the scenes in the composition of the latter document. The disappearance of the distasteful earlier "Aryan Paragraph" must also have been largely due to Fezer.

There is real ground, too, for hope that the full Evangelical Gospel and the genuine teaching of the Reformation will become the foundation stones of the new German Evangelical Church. This is made evident by Article I. of the Constitution: "The unassailable foundation of the German Evangelical Church is the Gospel of Jesus Christ as testified to us in Holy Scripture and brought to light afresh in the Articles of the Reformation. Thereby will be limited and determined the full powers which the Church needs for the carrying out of her mission."

The "German Christians" have, indeed, consistently declared it their aim to protect the teaching of the Reformation, and to rescue it from modern destructive liberalism, and from materialistic influences. In view of the accusation that they wish to set up a German Religion in place of the Evangelical Christianity of the Reformation, the following recent words of Müller are of especial importance: "It has been decisive for German destiny, German character, and German spirit, that God caused the rediscovery of the Gospel through the German, Martin Luther. . . . The Gospel is God's gift to mankind. It does not have its source in Germans, indeed, it has its source in no people at all."\*

There is a wealth of difference between the proclamation of a Gospel which has lost its genuine character through the intrusion of Germanic and idealistic conceptions, and the presentation of the full historic Gospel in language and manner capable of apprehension by the modern German.

The aim of the "German Christians" is officially declared to be that "the eternal Truth, which God has given to us in Jesus Christ, shall be preached in language and form which is understandable to the German."† The German People became to a large extent soulless during the War and the years following, and thus an understandable feature of life in Germany at the

\* Müller speaking at the *Lutherwoche* held at Eisleben, reported in *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, No. 34, August 25, p. 797.

† Taken from the *Neue Richtlinien*.



moment is the thirsting of the People, as a whole, in all stations of life, after some religion or definite outlook on life (*Weltanschauung*), and especially for a form that will harmonize satisfactorily with their reawakened and strongly national feelings; and, indeed, there is to be found in Germany at the moment a far-spread political "religiosity," which makes the Fatherland the focus for religious feeling. It is true to say that the People, in general, are wearied of godlessness and of materialistic ideas of life (which the German sometimes so expressively terms "Mammonismus"); nor will they rest satisfied in maintaining a placid indifference towards the spiritual world of unseen realities. It also seems certain that they will not be content with any merely negative creed.

There is certainly no lack of religious systems in the Germany of today, competing with orthodox Christianity in their efforts to answer the spiritual needs of the People, and they can roughly be divided into those directly anti-Christian, and those which seek to present certain definite views, which should not necessarily prove incompatible with membership of the German Protestant Church.

Of the former species the "Race and Blood" religion takes at the present moment a most prominent place. This avowedly non-Christian religion has been most forcibly presented by Alfred Rosenberg, the noted National Socialist politician, in a work entitled *Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts*.<sup>\*</sup> Rosenberg's religion is clothed in the most extravagant mystical and idealistic language. His position has its basis in a mystical identification of God and the soul; and, indeed, "God," "Race," "Blood," and "Soul" seem all but interchangeable terms, and this leads to a most arrogant conception of the superiority and self-sufficiency of the "noble Aryan." Most typical and repulsive is his view of sin: "Only inferior natures are aware of sin. The eternal, noble Aryan soul knows no sin. The feeling of sin is a necessary accompaniment of physical bastardy."<sup>†</sup> Rosenberg has taken care to assert that he was expressing personal views, and was in no sense proclaiming the religious position of his Party, but still his influence has been great in National Socialist circles,<sup>‡</sup> and particularly dangerous in that this glorification of the Aryan soul must prove a most acceptable and comfortable religious belief to the average National Socialist.

<sup>\*</sup> My source here has been a most able criticism of Rosenberg's position contained in Helmuth Schreiner, *Der Nationalsozialismus vor der Gottesfrage*.

<sup>†</sup> See Rosenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 73, quoted by Schreiner, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

<sup>‡</sup> See Schreiner, pp. 35 and 36. The *Völkischer Beobachter* (1930, No. 232) hailed Rosenberg as the "Great Master," and declared that "with this work Rosenberg has become a moulder of the German Nation."



Also irreconcilable with the Christian position is the religious outlook of the *Tannenbergbund*.<sup>\*</sup> The *Tannenbergbund* was founded in 1925 by General Ludendorff as a national movement, but its religious outlook is its most notable present feature, and this it owes chiefly to Frau Dr. Mathilde Ludendorff, who has written several widely circulated books, best known of which are *Deutscher Gottglaube* and *Erlösung von Jesu Christo*. Frau Ludendorff has produced a mystical philosophy which is strongly gnostic in character. Faith is made out to be the exact equivalent of a superior sort of reason. Religion is exclusively a creation of the blood, and the human soul is regarded as being Eternal God. But man must develop the Divine within him, which he can at first only faintly apprehend. The development of the world can be described in terms of increasing consciousness of God; but man presents the one and only consciousness of God, and thus mysticism is the sole legitimate form of German piety. Man is, however, created in imperfection, and he must—in complete contrast to Christian teaching—win to perfection through his own efforts. Few, in fact, and they are the élite of the gnostics, ever attain to the blissful state of perfection, and this is because man normally cannot escape from the accursed desire for the preservation of self (*Selbsterhaltungswillen*). The obvious criticism of such a philosophy is that human nature shows only too plainly that the more a man seeks to be free from self along the above lines, the more he comes under its tyranny.

Similar in many ways to the religion of Rosenberg and Frau Ludendorff is that of the *Deutsche Glaubensbewegung*, a leading member of which is Professor J. W. Hauer of Tübingen. Professor Hauer adheres to the Protestant Church, and would recognize the validity of the Evangelical and Catholic Faiths for certain of his fellow countrymen. But, in his view, a German religion which seeks to stand in line with the faith of the pre-Christian Germans and the idealism of Goethe and Schiller must have its place alongside of the two specifically Christian confessions. He, further, earnestly claims a position for this "German" religion within the new *Reichskirche*. The kernel of Hauer's religion lies in the creative power of God, and especially as such is to be seen at work in German history, destiny, and territory. He can speak of the Word of God within the German People.

Mention must be made also of the *Deutschkirche* Movement.<sup>†</sup> This Movement, founded in 1917, stands completely within the

<sup>\*</sup> My source here is a most excellent essay by Direktor Karl Witte, which appears in *Die Nation Vor Gott*, pp. 344-392.

<sup>†</sup> My source here is an essay by Pfarrer Gerhard Gloege, entitled "Die Deutschkirche," which appears in Part 3 of *Die Nation Vor Gott*.



Protestant Church. The members of the Movement emphasize their unwillingness to be regarded as a sect or even as a party within the Church. Their object can be shortly described as the presentation of Christianity in an exclusively German form, and this, of course, entails the task of releasing Christianity completely from its Semitic character. As is only to be expected, the result is a sorry wreck. God is presented in German form. "Jesus the hero shall be our leader; not as the South saw and estimated the Saviour, not 'Jesus the Lamb of God' who suffered uncomplainingly and unresistingly poured forth His Blood, but Jesus regarded and apprehended in German form."\* Jesus is naturally presented not as a Jew, but as an Aryan. The Bible must be transformed into a German Book, and all that does not suit the *Deutschkirche* pattern must be ruthlessly scrapped, while old German legends and the works of the German National Prophets are made to take a place of equal honour alongside that which is left of Scripture. Religious services must be purely German in tone, and all Jewish expressions such as "Alleluia" and "Hosanna" must be swept away. Idealism is again clearly at the basis. "If we face reality, religion must be held as entirely emanating from man. For God has not come to meet man, but man has slowly and laboriously felt his way to God."†

The object of providing a summary of four notable religious positions such as the above has been to bring out to the full the crisis which German Protestantism is now facing. Will the German People be brought under the Cross, or will they try to find a satisfaction for their craving for religion in acceptance of a narrow creed of German idealism? The position is nothing more or less than a choice between the Christian Gospel or national idealism. It is the conviction of the writer that in this crisis the decisive rôle will be played by the "German Christians." They have it in their power to provide the full Gospel, but, on the other hand, they can easily make a disastrous truce with the other non-Catholic religious forces in Germany, and thus assure the victory of "Germanic" idealism. But there is also a most vital part that can be played by Protestants outside the ranks of the "German Christians," and especially by the "Young Reformers." The majority of the "German Christians" wish for peace within the Church, and desire the co-operation of their fellow Christians. It seems probable that an united force of German Evangelicals, and that alone, can rescue German Protestantism from the menace of an idealistic and blasphemous creed. It is the solemn duty of every non-"German Christian" Protestant to think deeply whether he is acting rightly in

\* Quoted by Gloege, p. 322.

† *Ibid.*, p. 327.



standing aloof at this hour of destiny. The majority of German Protestants are agreed that the Gospel must be given to the People, and such an aim should be sufficient to overcome differences of opinion as to the government of the Church, or the relations of Church to State, and to surmount the petty struggles of Church politics. Can it be right for a Christian to stand aside when a battle is going on for the possession of a People's soul? It seems evident that the principal objection of the man who stands outside the ranks of the "German Christians" is that the purity, and, indeed, the very contents, of the Gospel and of his Reformation heritage are threatened. But the influence of one who stands aloof is in the present situation of necessity quite negative. The need of the Church at the moment is indisputably for men who will dare to take their places, as fighters, right at the very centre of affairs, thanking God for the great opportunity He has vouchsafed to their Church, and determined to work for the spread of the true Evangelical Gospel among the reawakened German People.

R. J. C. GUTTERIDGE.

---

### CANONICAL OBEDIENCE\*

THE recent history of the Church of England seems to be in some ways analogous to the history of the people of Israel in the time of the Judges, which is described as a period during which "there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes."

Not in every respect, of course: for in most important respects the members of the Church of England, like other Englishmen, are the most law-abiding people. But more particularly in the matter of the public worship of the Church I think it will be conceded by most fair-minded persons that for a considerable period up to the present day almost every congregation of Churchpeople, led, or at least not discouraged, by the clergy, have done what seemed right in their own eyes: so that it came to be acknowledged, in words that have been often quoted during the last few years, that "the law of public worship in the Church of England is too narrow for the religious life of the present generation . . . and that in an age which has witnessed an extraordinary revival of spiritual life and activity the Church has had to work under regulations fitted for a

\* A paper read before the Salisbury Clerical Society, January 30, 1933.



different condition of things, without that power of self-adjustment which is inherent in the conception of a living Church." This has meant, strictly speaking, that the present generation of Churchpeople have been, whether consciously and deliberately or not, lawless, in this matter of public worship at any rate, which is admitted to be one of the most important and central activities of the Church. In other words, we have been lawless because we either would not, or could not, keep the law.

It is not my intention, nor is it the object of this paper, to attempt a description of the steps that have been taken to remedy this state of affairs, which culminated in the drawing up of the Revised Prayer Book Measures, which were successively rejected by the House of Commons in circumstances that are well known to us all. Suffice it to say that it is admitted on all sides that we are in a confused and somewhat illogical situation at the present time. The law of our public worship is obviously too narrow for our needs: the particular change in the law which we desired has not been permitted to us by the State, under which we are, as a Church, "Established" in England. Our Bishops (or a majority of them) have permitted us to act as if the change in the law had already been effected, and have assured us that when, by our Oath of Canonical Obedience, we have sworn that we have undertaken to use the said Book (of Common Prayer) "and no other, except as shall be ordered by lawful authority," we have not broken that oath when we use the "additions and deviations" to or from the said Book of Common Prayer. These, they say, are, at any rate, permitted by their authority, although it is quite plainly declared in the printed edition of the Prayer Book in which these alterations are incorporated that the "publication of this book does not directly or indirectly imply that it can be regarded as authorized for use in Churches."

It is no wonder that there is a great deal of thoughtful enquiry as to what authority it is to which we owe obedience, and as to what the law is which this authority is attempting to administer. And if it is "canonical obedience" by which we clergy are bound, it is important that we should have some clear idea as to what this canonical obedience means. For in the minds of many of the laity the clergy are often accused of being false to their ordination vows and to their oath of canonical obedience: and it seems to me to be a most important and vital need that we should be in a position to clear ourselves of such a charge, for the sake of those who in their turn owe us their trust. Or, if not, to take such steps as are possible at the earliest moment to obtain a law and acknowledge an authority to which we can, without qualm of conscience, render our due



and lawful obedience. That perplexity as to this question is shared by others besides myself is shown by the fact that within recent months a Joint Committee was successfully asked for by the Lower House of the Convocation of York, in order to ascertain what the meaning of "canonical obedience" really is. To suggest some lines on which that question might be answered is the object of this paper.

## I

The first obvious explanation of "canonical obedience" is that it means *obedience to the Canons*. And so it does. What, then, are these "canons" to which obedience is owed? The word "canon" means simply a rule of conduct. And such rules there must of course be in any ordered society such as the Church. There has always been, in fact, some law of the Church, of which the natural administrator was the Bishop, as the head of each local body of Churchpeople, since the unit of Church administration has always been the Diocese. And this Church Law soon came to be defined by custom and reference to the "canonical" Scriptures.

But, although each Bishop in his own Diocese has naturally been regarded as the supreme and sufficient ruler and lawgiver for his own portion of the Church, yet his personal decisions have always been guided and limited by a wider law; *morally*, by the broad principles of right and wrong, which no individual could override; and *doctrinally*, by the decisions of the Church as a whole—*i.e.*, the principles of the Catholic Faith as defined by Councils of the Church, and accepted by the general consent of the faithful. Usually the doctrinal standards of the first four (or sometimes six) so-called General Councils have been accepted as defining the limits by which individual Bishops are bound. But with regard to other matters, the customs by which Bishops, both in East and in West, have administered their Dioceses have varied greatly in the history of the Church.

It was naturally very soon that the rules or "canons" by which the Bishops' administration was guided began to be collected into codes or systems of law, which gradually became extensive and elaborate, as the Church grew and multiplied. These were at first, like much else, supposed to have been derived from the authority of the Apostles, and collections of "Apostolic Canons" were compiled from the fourth century onwards. Gradually a system of Church Canon Law was built up, based upon the decisions of individual Bishops or Councils of Bishops, and ratified by the consent of the Church after the decisions had been made. Nothing, however, prevented a



particular canon or custom, which was found to be unsatisfactory, from being afterwards modified or set aside altogether, either by tacit consent or by definite enactment to the contrary.

But for us in the West, the great interest lies in the rising power and influence of the Apostolic See of Rome, and the gradual recognition of the Pope as the source of all the spiritual law of the Church, just as the Emperor was regarded as the source of all the secular law of the State. A great impetus was given to this development by the circulation of what are now known as the "Forged Decretals," the work of the pseudo-Isidore of Seville in the ninth century: and it soon began to be believed that all the canons of the Church derived their authority from decrees of the Pope. This belief was stereotyped by the work of Gratian, a Benedictine monk of Italy, in the twelfth century, whose "Decretum" was the great storehouse of mediæval Canon Law. Gratian's "Decretum" was properly entitled "A Concord of Discordant Canons" and aimed at systematizing all the canons of the Church, just as the Code of Justinian had systematized the secular law. He regarded the ecclesiastical law as, in fact, analogous to the civil law, deriving its force, not from the assent of the Church, but from the centralized authority of the Pope, regarded as the sole source of Church Law, as the Emperor was of State Law. It was all built on the analogy of the "Corpus" of Civil Law, and assumed that there is a central power in the Church which can modify the spiritual law or apply it so as to suit particular cases. In fact, Bishop Creighton has said that the principle of the mediæval canon law was that the episcopal jurisdiction must be reduced to a shadow, and the papal jurisdiction substituted in its stead.

In consequence of all this, the work of Gratian and other learned canonists was consolidated into a regular "Corpus" of Canon Law in the sixteenth century, by which a common Church Law was established everywhere, only limited by local custom, which after a prescription of forty years could supersede it—at least, in theory. There is no doubt that, subject to this exception as to local custom, the whole of the ancient Canon Law of the Church of Rome was deemed to run in England up to the time of the Reformation in the sixteenth century. The most popular textbook in use in this country was a collection of canons compiled by William Lyndwood (1375-1446), who was Official Principal to the Archbishop of Canterbury and Dean of the Arches, and subsequently Bishop of St. David's. His book was called the *Provinciale*, or codification of *English Provincial Canon Law*, was published in 1432, and formally accepted as authoritative by both Canterbury and York Con-



vocations. It may be said to represent the normal practice of the Court of Arches in his time, that is, the chief ecclesiastical Court in this country.

But it is necessary, in order to understand the subsequent history of Canon Law in England, to explain that Ecclesiastical Law is governed by a principle which has no place in Civil Law, namely, the principle of *desuetude*. In Civil Law the principle holds good that "every Statute, however ancient, continues in force until repealed by another Statute" (Maitland). In Canon Law, however, it is recognized that a new custom, or a definite practice to the contrary, *ipso facto* abrogates an old canon. This is known as *desuetude*—not simply non-user or simple neglect, nor the result of mere ignorance or error—but the definite establishment of a contrary custom, which, after it has been established for a period of forty years, becomes itself law, not by enactment, but by use.

This principle has always been recognized even in Roman Canon Law: but it was so obviously at variance with the foundation principle of the whole mediæval system that it was restricted in every possible way so that the possibility of abrogation should be reduced to a minimum. It may be interesting to refer to some examples of ancient canonical enactments now rendered obsolete by *desuetude*—*e.g.*:

Sending away of catechumens from the Holy Mysteries.

Rule of standing for prayer in Eastertide.

Prohibition of certain trades and occupations to Christians.

Penalties for dancing.

Translation of Bishops (forbidden by the Council of Nicæa).

The English Church, however, has taken full advantage of this principle of *desuetude* during the last four hundred years: and with this in mind, we are ready to pass on to the history of the Canon Law in England since the sixteenth century.

## II

The starting-point is the Act of 25 Henry VIII., called "The Submission of the Clergy," 1534. Under this Act Convocation undertook :

(1) Not to enact canons in the future without Royal licence and assent.

(2) That the existing canons should be examined by a Commission, and such as were found to stand with God's law and the laws of the Realm should continue in force, and the rest should be abrogated.



This is important as recognizing that the proper authority for enacting canons in the Church of England is the Convocation of the Church—*i.e.*, the Bishops and clergy duly assembled as a Provincial Synod.

The Commission referred to in the Act was duly appointed, and under Archbishop Cranmer's influence reported in 1553 to the Crown a draft scheme known as the *Reformatio Legum*, under which Convocation would have been reduced to Bishops only, and to be summoned only at the pleasure of the Metropolitan. The clergy would have been commanded to meet in Diocesan or Episcopal Synods every year. This, however, was never carried out, and although there were some exceedingly valuable features in the scheme, it was no doubt providential that we were never committed to this attempt to codify our ecclesiastical laws in that confused and bitter age, but fell back upon the better method at that time of elimination by growth. But it is most significant that Lyndwood's *Provinciale* of 1432 was translated into English and widely circulated in the year 1534, the same year as Henry VIII.'s Act. This seems to show that it was desired that English Churchmen should remain familiar with the ancient Canon Law, and should, at any rate, know what the existing canons were under which the Church Law was still administered.

It is obvious, however, that at the Reformation a great deal of the mediæval Canon Law at once became abrogated with the disregard of the authority which imposed it, through the break with the Papacy: so that, in actual fact, a great part of Lyndwood's *Provinciale* has lapsed owing to the subsequent legislation of the English Church, and the operation of the principle of desuetude. Such, for example, are the Canons relating to (1) Benefit of Clergy, which came to an end in 1828, and (2) Matters of Probate, which have long since ceased to be the business of Church Courts. It is argued by some that the principle of desuetude does not, in fact, apply any longer in England, because we are now governed solely by Statute Law (the Act of 1534): and again by others that the mediæval Canon Law has never been formally abrogated by the English Church, and that therefore the whole of it still remains in force at the present time. This will probably be a matter for discussion, but it is at least true that the amount of deliberate amendment which has taken place since the Reformation is small, for reasons which will shortly appear.

At any rate, amid all the confusion and uncertainty of the Reformation period, one thing seems to stand out quite clearly, that, whatever happened, the Church of England claimed, and intended, to be a true and living part of the Catholic Church of



Christ, and, as such, to be as fully entitled to revise, abrogate or enact such canons as any part of the Church is entitled to do for itself and its own people.

Various attempts were made to enact new canons in Queen Elizabeth's reign but without success, the only document approaching the canonical which was enacted by Convocation being the XXXIX. Articles of 1562, which were taken as a doctrinal statement, to which the clergy of the Church of England have been required to give their assent. But in 1603, under the guidance of that very able and far-seeing prelate, Archbishop Bancroft, the 141 canons were passed by Convocation, and they remain, with certain modifications, the only body of canons legally enacted by Convocation since the Reformation. There were some other canons passed in 1640, but they do not seem to have superseded those of 1603.

It is significant, however, that Lyndwood's *Provinciale* was again reprinted in 1679, as if to show that the Canons of 1603 should be still regarded as resting on the background of the ancient Canon Law, with which it was always presumed that the clergy were well acquainted. It was Bancroft, incidentally, who made great use in his time of the system of "presentments" at Episcopal Visitations, in order to inform the clergy as to what the law of the Church actually was.

One hundred years later, Queen Anne produced a set of draft canons which were not assented to, and in 1717, as is well known, Convocation was suppressed for all but the merest formality, and was not revived again until 1852. Since then two new canons have been enacted, and two others altered: these are concerned with the Oath of Allegiance and legal declarations against simony. Draft revisions were attempted unsuccessfully in 1874 and 1879: but to all intents and purposes, no new canons of any importance have been enacted by the Church of England since 1603.

### III

The position, then, as regards the Canon Law of the Church of England seems to be this:

(1) Pre-Reformation Canon Law is still binding under the Act of the Submission of the Clergy, except so far as it has been varied or abrogated by lawful authority. This has been actually recognized by both secular and ecclesiastical courts during the nineteenth century.

(2) Any canons enacted since the Act of Submission are legal, provided that they conform to the conditions of that Act, namely, that permission to enact, and assent to what has been



enacted, has been given by the Crown. This covers the Canons of 1603, and any subsequent modification of or addition to them.

(3) It is also argued that enactments of Convocation have the force of canons, such as the XXXIX. Articles and the Rubrics of the Prayer Book, as being parts of an Act of Uniformity assented to by Convocation. The 1662 Prayer Book certainly had the fullest sanction of Convocation, and it is arguable as to whether each detail of the Rubrics is meant to be interpreted as part of a legal document or not: difference of opinion as to this has caused a great deal of trouble in the past and may yet do so in the future, until it is determined once for all whether the Prayer Book is a document of civil or of ecclesiastical law: if the latter, then the principle of desuetude would seem to apply to Rubrics as to other evidences of customary usage. I should myself prefer the view that the Rubrics of the Prayer Book ought to be interpreted in the light of the Canons of the Church: the most crucial instance is the Ornaments Rubric, which was deliberately retained in 1662 in spite of all protests, and enjoins the standard of ceremonial which was that of the period just before the first Prayer Book of 1549. This was in point of fact the standard of Lyndwood's *Provinciale*, which contains an inventory of the accessories of public worship such as might have been scheduled under the Ornaments Rubric, and, as I have already mentioned, was issued in a new edition not many years after the 1662 Prayer Book became law.

(4) Decisions of Church Courts are held to be valid decisions in Church law, until they are over-ruled by competent authority. The whole trouble during the so-called "Ritual" prosecutions in the last century arose because the Court in question was not acknowledged by those who were tried before it as a Church Court at all. We need not enter into that at length now, but I think I can safely say that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is not likely to be regarded by most Churchpeople as a true Church Court in any future period of our Church history, unless it is radically altered.

(5) It is also taken for granted that nowadays secular law (*i.e.*, that embodied in Acts of Parliament) is binding upon Churchpeople, so long as it has been accepted by the Church. Examples of this are well known in recent times—*e.g.*, the Church Rates Acts of about 1870; the Clergy Discipline Act of 1892 (which was accepted formally by Convocation); and the recent Tithe Act of 1925. On the other hand, the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act of 1872 and the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874 have been repudiated by the Church; and the



Marriage of Deceased Wife's Sister and cognate Acts and the Divorce Act of 1857 have never been assented to.

(6) It is a matter of considerable doubt and of some concern among many thoughtful people as to how far the functions and activities of the Church Assembly set up by law in 1919 have infringed upon or altered the powers and privileges of Convocation. The Church Assembly was legally sanctioned in order to permit the Church to initiate and debate its own measures, subject to the final approval of the Houses of Parliament, and ultimately of the Crown. For this purpose the laity were officially associated with the Bishops and the clergy: but I think it is true to say that it was not intended, nor is it, in fact, the case, that the authority of Convocation is in any way superseded or infringed by any powers the Assembly may possess. The Convocations are still the Provincial Synods of the Church of England, and as such, to them alone belongs the power of enacting canons to which obedience must be rendered. This is not to say that measures promoted by the Church Assembly may not become the law of the land, but to have canonical force and authority such measures must be formally promulgated by Convocation according to the Act for the Submission of the Clergy. It is well known that if the Prayer Book Measure of 1927 had received the Royal Assent, it would have been so promulgated by Convocation and have become a Canon of the Church. But perhaps it is providential that this did not take place, for if the Bishops claim the obedience of the clergy to any of the provisions of that Measure, they can only do so by their own personal persuasion, and cannot legally lay such a charge upon their clergy by any claim to canonical obedience. It is, indeed, a matter of somewhat grave concern, as it seems to me, that nowadays Bishops are often claiming a good deal from their clergy under plea of their oath of canonical obedience. And for this reason it is very important that the clergy should understand what exactly canonical obedience does mean, and what exactly is the ecclesiastical law which the Bishops are bound to administer. It is also a matter which causes some anxiety that the Church Assembly, in spite of all the good work it has done during the last few years, has undoubtedly promoted some measures which are somewhat ill-advised, and are calculated, if not carefully watched, to take away some very ancient rights and privileges from both clergy and laity. I need only refer to the Patronage of Benefices Measure, the Benefices (Ecclesiastical Duties) Measure, and perhaps the Dilapidations Measure, which, when passed, actually become the law of the land, and if assented to by the Church are binding upon the consciences of Churchpeople, although, as these are statute laws,



steps can be taken to have them repealed, if they are found to be unworkable. There is also this further point, that, as the legislative fecundity of the Church Assembly produces more measures which are apt to be somewhat hastily drafted, it becomes very necessary to have a system of Church Courts which command the confidence of the Church, before which questions arising out of purely Church legislation can be properly judged. The question of Church Courts has been somewhat in abeyance since the "Ritual" prosecutions practically ceased after the trial of Bishop King of Lincoln before the Archbishop's Court in 1890, but it has always been in the background, and after the scandalous cases we have been forced to witness during recent years, there is no doubt that a thorough revision and reconstruction of the Church Courts would be welcomed by all Churchpeople, and would be of immense benefit to the Church as a whole.

But, before this is done, there must also be a proper understanding of the law which such Courts are to administer: and therefore I deem it to be of the greatest importance that we should work for the reappointment of the Commission which was promised by King Henry VIII., which is now nearly 400 years overdue, that it may examine and codify the existing Canon Law of the Church of England, and explain which of the canons are applicable to present-day needs, so that the way may be cleared for the much-needed enactment of new canons, and the establishment of proper legislative, administrative, and judicial machinery.

After all, is it not rather absurd that our daughter Churches in the Anglican Communion, such as the Church of the Province of South Africa or the Scottish Episcopal Church, should be able to frame and apply their own canons according to their needs, and the Mother Church of England should be largely at the mercy of the Bishops, collectively or individually, without the proper knowledge of the canons for which they claim our obedience? Every Bishop, of course, has the right to legislate in his own Diocese according to the *jus liturgicum* which every reasonable person would concede to him: but it would be a very good thing, and, in my opinion, a very necessary thing, if every Bishop were compelled by canon to assemble a Diocesan Synod of his clergy at regular intervals, which should not merely be consulted, but which should be required to give its assent to any measures passed by the Provincial Synod and intended for the Diocese as a whole, and before which cases of discipline could formally be brought. As to whether the laity should be associated with the Bishop and his clergy in formal synod is a matter of opinion: if it were desirable,



it might at least save the Diocesan Conference from becoming the futile debating ground of trivialities which it so often is.

But I would venture to conclude these somewhat desultory remarks by saying that it is at least as important to prevent the parish priest from claiming, as he sometimes does, "inherent rights" as an individual, which seem to absolve him from his oath of canonical obedience to his Bishop, as it is to ensure that the Bishop himself does not act in an arbitrary and prelati- cal fashion, nor in slavish reliance upon a bureaucracy of so-called "experts," but in an orderly and constitutional manner, according to the canons, taking counsel with his clergy in proper synodical form, and limiting his episcopal rights both by ecclesiastical law and established custom.

Only so will our Fathers in God be able to claim with all confidence the canonical obedience of all their clergy "in all things lawful and honest," to which they are properly entitled, and which we are only too ready and willing to accord to them.

A. R. BELLARS.

#### LIST OF AUTHORITIES

- COLLINS, BISHOP W. E. *The Nature and Force of the Canon Law.* (Church Historical Society. Paper xxxiv.) 1898.
- COLLINS, BISHOP W. E. *The Rights of a Particular Church in Matters of Practice.* (Church Historical Society. Paper lxxxii.) 1904.
- LYNDWOOD. *Provinciale.* (Edited by J. V. Bullard and H. C. Bell.) Faith Press. 1929.
- The Diocesan Synod of Pope Benedict XIV.* (Edited by W. R. V. Brade and C. E. Douglas.) Faith Press. 1926.
- Constitutions and Canons of 1603.* S.P.C.K.
- DIXON, W. *History of the Church of England*, vol. iii., pp. 378 *f.*
- OLLARD AND CROSSE. *Dictionary of English Church History.* 1912. Art. "Canon Law."
- Voces Clamantium* (The Clergy and the Church Assembly). (Ed. H. C. Bell.) Faith Press. 1929.
- Episcopacy Ancient and Modern.* (Edited by C. Jenkins and K. D. Mackenzie.) S.P.C.K. 1930.
- NEWBOLT, W. C. E. *Consolidation.* (Alcuin Club Tracts ii.) Longmans. 1898.
- HATCH, E. *The Growth of Church Institutions.* Hodder. 1887.
- BRIGHT, W. *Canons of the First Four General Councils.* Oxford. 1882.
- LATHBURY, T. *History of Convocation to 1742.* (2nd edition.) 1853.



## AN IRISH BISHOP OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

IN the year 1734 two remarkable men held the adjoining bishoprics of Cork and Cloyne. Peter Browne, the elder of the two, had already presided over the united dioceses of Cork and Ross for twenty-four years when George Berkeley was appointed to the see of Cloyne. They had previously touched one another at various points. Browne was Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, from 1699 to 1709, and Berkeley was one of its Fellows in 1707. They had also engaged in controversy.

But whilst Berkeley has received full recognition, and though the philosophical theories connected with his name are today coming more to the front, Browne has been given but very scant attention. He is referred to by Professor Campbell Fraser and by the more recent biographers of Berkeley, Hone, and Rossi. He appears in the lists of Provosts of Trinity College and in the *Fasti* of the Church of Ireland. A little more than one column is allotted to his life and writings in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, but in none of these notices of Browne does the real man that he was appear.

It is true that at times he was vehement in controversy. Religious people of his time seem to have felt their religion to be a much more serious matter than it often is nowadays, and so long as men feel strongly they will be prone to express their feelings strongly. Browne was also suspected of Jacobite tendencies, and his charge *Of Drinking in Remembrance of the Dead*, published at the request of his clergy, was met by an outburst of feeling which surprised the author himself.

Browne saw in the custom of drinking to the memory of the dead an abuse and profanation of the Holy Eucharist.

"It is not," he says, "a question of making an honourable remembrance of great and worthy persons, nor whether we are to be well affected towards the late Revolution or not, nor whether we are to honour the memory of King William, nor is it a question of remembering an absent friend, or our sovereign, by wishing them health and prosperity."

He has no doubt as to these matters, but here—

"there is an application made of the action of drinking to a mere man, in that very manner which ought never to be applied but to the Person of Christ."

During Browne's episcopate, too, differences arose between him and Dr. Rowland Davies, the Dean of the Cathedral Church of Cork, with regard to the political opinions of two ordinands.

Incidents such as these afford some justification for the



remarks of Hone and Rossi that Browne "inspired a great deal of dislike and suspicion among his contemporaries" (Bishop Berkeley, *His Life, Writings, and Philosophy*, p. 18). A full and true estimate of Browne's real character can only be formed from materials at hand but never yet made public.

Without his *Præces Privatae* we could never paint for ourselves the picture of Lancelot Andrewes that it is possible to do by its aid. The book is in a measure an autobiography. It is, too, when we turn to Laud's *Book of Devotions* that we find the real secret of his life, and realize how he learned to die. If it were asked who William Law was and what kind of man, it would be enough to say that he was the author of the *Serious Call*. Such, too, is the revealing power of the *Sacra Privata* of Thomas Wilson; and of similar value are the manuscript prayers of many a saint of God. They let us into the secret communings of struggling souls and enable us to see into the innermost man. They help us to form a just estimate of those who compose or bring them together. So it is here also. Bishop Browne left behind him, in addition to other manuscripts, a *Book of Devotions*, and it is chiefly the object of this paper to give to others something of what that precious little volume contains, and consequently much whereby a true estimate of his character can be reached.

Before doing so, however, something must be said of the varied career of the author and of the surroundings, intellectual and moral, in which he spent his life.

The year 1682 in which Browne entered Trinity College, Dublin, is marked by the matriculation of three others, who, with Browne, proceeded to the degree of B.A. at the same commencements. Thomas Wilson became Bishop of Sodor and Man. Edward Chandler was appointed to the bishopric of Lichfield and Coventry and was afterwards translated to Durham. Jonathan Swift came to hold a unique position in the Ireland of his day.

At one time it seemed as if Browne and Swift as well as the two other graduates were destined to give their services to the Church in England. Before James II. landed in Ireland both crossed over, as did also the greater number of the Fellows of Trinity College "for their better security." During his stay in England Browne was given Priests' Orders by the Bishop of London in St. Andrew's Church, Holborn, on February 24, 1689. When the Revolution had done its work Browne was elected to a Fellowship in his Alma Mater, and from that year (1692) his work and interests lay in Ireland, where he was soon to be brought into prominence. The state of public morals in Great Britain and Ireland during the Restoration period was lament-



able. There was, too, a widespread disbelief in revealed religion, and the Christian faith and the mysteries of it were oftentimes objects of profane mockery. The reign of James II. showed no improvement, and the Church's difficulties in dealing with immorality were increased by the King's attitude towards the bishops. Again, in 1696, English Deism, which, in its first beginnings, goes back to Lord Herbert of Cherbury, was given a fresh impetus by the publication of a treatise styled *Christianity not Mystrious*, written by a young Irishman, John Toland, who had been brought up a Roman Catholic. The excitement caused by this book was out of all proportion to its importance. The secular arm was used against it. It was condemned by the Grand Jury of Middlesex. The book was burnt by the hangman in Dublin by order of the Irish House of Commons. It was condemned by the lower House of Convocation, and Toland's heretical opinions were denounced in unmeasured terms from the pulpits of the Church of Ireland.

It was his answer to Toland that first brought Browne into prominence as a defender of orthodoxy. In a later work he developed his argument against Toland, but it must suffice to quote here one short paragraph from the earlier *Letter*. It will show the method adopted by controversialists in that age.

"His (Toland's) heresy is as old as Eunomius and now revived by this upstart, as he very aptly calls himself. And I think we may well call this new-old sect of his the Gnostics of our age, since they are a profound sort of people, who set up for knowing everything and believing nothing."

We can only briefly refer here to Browne's other published writings.

When the civic authorities of Dublin determined to put the law into execution against vice and immorality, Browne preached a sermon in St. Bride's Church dealing with the subject, which at the time attracted much attention. To overcome vice, he pointed out, needed more than royal proclamations and the use of the secular arm. The clergy in particular must look more closely to themselves and their people; they must be diligent in pastoral visitation and in the instruction of the young; they must observe the Church's directions as to the due and seemly performance of the Church's rites, and be careful to conform themselves and their families to all that their sacred office demands of them. The instruction and bettering of men's souls is to be their chief endeavours. So would the torrent of vice be stemmed and the apostasy that threatened be warded off.

Browne's term of office (1709-1735) as Bishop of Cork and Ross was the most fruitful period of his life. For the second time in the history of those united dioceses a Provost of Trinity College became its Bishop, but Browne's episcopate far surpassed



that of Chappell, the friend of Laud, in usefulness and importance. It is evident from the Bishop's attention to diocesan details that his supervision of the churches and of the clergy's work was exercised with a deep sense of responsibility. In a series of memoranda written at the end of the *Book of Devotions*, now in the present writer's possession, there occurs the following:

Building new Churches. Repairing the old. Enclosing all Churchyards. Keeping Churches and Churchyards clean. Terriers of Glebes. Preventing burials in Churches.

The conduct of Divine Service and the care to be exercised by the clergy in administering the sacraments and carrying out other parts of the office were also objects of the Bishop's solicitude. Here are his directions:

Public Baptism on Sundays and holidays. With trine immersion. Private Baptisms registered as such. Churcing at the rails of the Chancel. The rubric always read to the women. The water poured into the Font at the time of Baptizing. The same water never consecrated twice, but always poured out after baptizing is over. Women put in mind of preparing for the Communion before they are Churched, and on Sunday morning. Notice for Confirmation in all Churches on the first Sunday in Lent. Performed after Easter. None but at years of discretion. Examination the Friday before. On Sundays with Communion. All expelled from the Eucharist by their Minister who have not been confirmed and are not ready and desirous to be so at the first opportunity. Every clergyman to have a list of the poor housekeepers of his parish to lay before such as are able to relieve them.

Here, again, are the Bishop's memoranda relating to the parochial schools and the clergyman's work in them:

Every clergyman to direct and instruct the school masters and mistresses of their parish in the way and manner of teaching children the Catechism—viz., to make them speak distinctly and deliberately. To repeat every sentence by itself and not two or three more sentences in one breath. To explain the meaning of every word in the Catechism which is not a particle. To make them get Psalms and other Scriptures by heart. To teach them to pray by making them kneel and repeat their prayers distinctly, and at every sentence asking them whether they think of what they say and lift up their mind to God in every part of the prayer. To teach them to join in the public worship of God in Church.

Sympathetic help to all who needed it seems to have marked Bishop Browne's whole episcopate. His efforts towards alleviating the want that prevailed in his city in the year 1729 were recognized by the civic authorities, and a resolution of thanks was conveyed to him "for his great and extensive charity to the poor of this city at this time of scarcity and want."

On all sides there was, too, a growing interest in spiritual things amongst the churchpeople of Cork. Two new churches were built in the city and a third rebuilt. Towards the close of



Browne's episcopate the taking down of the Cathedral Church of Cork and the erection of a new one was determined on, according to a plan suggested by the Bishop. The number of pieces of church plate presented to churches throughout his dioceses during his episcopate is very noticeable and points to an awakened spiritual life.

Nor was the good man's pen idle during his busy years in Cork. His theory on the nature of man's knowledge of God and His attributes can be gathered from his *Procedure, Extent and Limits of Human Understanding*, a work which was criticized by Berkeley in *Alciphron*. Berkeley's strictures in turn called forth from Browne *Things Divine and Supernatural conceived by Analogy with Things Natural and Human*. And whilst Berkeley did not feel called on to reply to it, it is interesting to note that this last and remarkable book of Browne's anticipated much of the argument of Mansel's Bampton Lectures.

It is, however, with his *Book of Devotions* that we are chiefly concerned here. Much after the manner of Andrewes, Browne had the gift of bringing portions of Scripture together and forming them into prayers and intercessions and subjects for meditation. It was his custom, too, to use the Hebrew version when repeating any passages from the Psalter in his private devotions. He started his daily prayers with the resolution:

To habituate myself to awaken with a thought of God, and say Psalm lxxiii. 22-24 and Psalm iii. 5 in Hebrew.

*Before Rising say :*

Blessing and Glory and Wisdom and Thanksgiving and Honour and Power and Might be unto our God for ever and ever. Amen.

In the name and in the mercy, in the Blessing and Protection and Guidance of the Most High God.

*Going Out :*

The Blessing of the Lord God of heaven and earth be upon me in my lying down and my rising up, my going out and my coming in from this time forth for evermore. Amen.

*Entering the Church :*

Psalm v. 7 in Hebrew.

O Lord look down from heaven and behold from the Habitation of thy Holiness and thy Glory; and descend with Healing in thy wings, with Healing for the manifold Frailties and Infirmities of Human nature.

*After the Blessing :*

Let this thy Blessing rest upon the heads of all here present and upon me also, O my God; and upon all my Diocese both Clergy and Laity for the flourishing of thy Truth and for dispelling from among us all Infidelity, Heresy and Schism and Immorality.



*Coming Out :*

O let not any one of us go out from thy Presence without a new Blessing and some farther increase of thy Holy Spirit.

*Closing my Eyes :*

Psalm xxxi. 6 and Psalm iv. 9 in Hebrew.

*Awake in the Night :*

Psalm cxliii. 5.

*Riding or Walking :*

Psalms cxlv., cxxxix., ciii. in Hebrew.  
Te Deum.

*Singing Alone :*

I heard a voice, etc. (Psalm xxiii, Tate and Brady's Translation.)

Here follow a number of prayers which in their address to the Deity are typical of the period. A prayer for protection and preservation in time of danger and temptation begins:

O thou tremendous Majesty of heaven and most merciful Father before whom the whole Creation bows and obeys, thou most stupendous marvellous Being, most glorious and Incomprehensible Spirit, the great Creator and Preserver and Disposer of all things in Heaven and in Earth, Thou God of Infinite Power and Wisdom and Goodness, the only Source and Fountain of all Purity and Perfection and Holiness. It is Thee I worship and adore with the lowest Reverence and Humility both of my soul and body.

Then follows a prayer which deserves to be given here in full:

O Lord Jesus Christ, thou Saviour of the world who sittest at the right hand of God in the Glory of the Father, in the Regions of Peace and Tranquility and Love, in Inaccessible light and unconceivable Glory and Holiness, look down with infinite mercy and compassion upon me thy poor creature in this vale of misery and shadow of death so far removed from the Presence of thy Glory. Seal the Pardon of all my sins, both of omission and commission, and be reconciled unto me. Speak Peace to my soul and say unto it, I am thy Salvation. Send down thy Holy Spirit upon me that he may renew and sanctify me daily, that he may root out of me perfectly all sin and wickedness and raise up in me all divine and heavenly virtues. O give me all the Virtues and Graces which are necessary for a due Discharge of my Episcopal Function. Give me Courage and Resolution, Diligence and Sincerity, and a truly Meek and Humble Spirit. Open thou mine eyes that I may see the wondrous things of thy Law. Enlighten my understanding with the Knowledge of thy Truth, and let thy good Spirit lead me into all things which shall be most for the Glory of thy Name, and for the Good of Souls.

One other prayer from the good Bishop's daily devotions must be given:

O thou who art the Eternal Fountain of Wisdom, the great Head and Bishop of thy Church, who didst send down thy Holy Spirit upon the



Apostles in a visible Appearance and hast promised to be with them to the end of the world, do thou cleanse and defend it from all Infidelity and Heresy, Schism and Immorality. Let thy mighty Power and Energy of thy Spirit be with all spiritual Pastors and their Flocks, and particularly with [the Archbishop of Cashel our worthy Metropolitan] and be it unto me and my Dioceses according to all thy Holy Promises. Pour out the abundance of thy Grace upon all the Clergy and Laity of them: and upon me also O my God. Give me the guidance and direction, the support and Comfort, the Joy and Consolation of thy Holy Spirit in the Discharge of the Sacred Function which thou in thy unbounded Goodness and Mercy hast called me to.

The daily devotions close with a mediation and ascription:

Now through the ineffable Fervor and Efficacy of those Prayers and Supplications which thou didst offer up for us in the days of thy flesh; Through the unknown sufferings of thy unconceivable Agony ✠, and the Infinite merits of that divine Sacrifice upon the Cross ✠. Through the Almighty Power of thy Mediation and Intercession for us; and in the Virtue of this Prayer of thy own composing which thou hast commanded us to say, hear me, O Christ, in the Multitude of thy Mercies and in the Truth of thy Salvation.

Our Father.

Ascription.

Psalm cxlv. in Hebrew.

The most interesting portion of the Bishop's MS. from a liturgical point of view is that relating to his private devotions as Celebrant. The *ἐπίκλησις* is noteworthy:

*Approaching the Altar:*

Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty: Holiness becometh thy House for ever.

*Placing the Alms:*

Lord do thou graciously accept these our Alms, Part of thy Bounty to us thy servants, which I most unworthy Present before thee upon thy Holy Table.

*Placing the Elements:*

This Bread and this Wine we sinners offer and present on thine Altar O Lord for a memorial of the All sufficient Sacrifice of thy Son Jesus. Send down thy Holy Spirit upon them for a Divine and quickening energy, that we may receive them again from thee as his Body and Blood. And be thou Propitious and Merciful unto us in contemplation of his Infinite Merits and All powerful Mediation and Intercession.

*After Eating the Bread:*

O Lord Jesu Christ, as I am allowed the Glorious Privilege of eating of that Sacrifice which was offered up for my sins, let me thereby become one with it: and by virtue of thy Holy Institution make me Partaker of the ineffable Union with thee which shall entitle me to all the Blessed and Everlasting consequences of thy precious Death and Agony.



*After the Cup :*

O thou who hast opened this Fountain for sin and for uncleanness, wash away the guilt of all my sins in thy Blood. Though they be as scarlet yet do thou make me white as snow; and in thy own good time present me spotless before the Presence of thy Glory.

The remaining portion of the MS. is taken up with "Scripture sayings for subject of Prayer or Meditation, etc." Passages bearing on Invocation, Confession of Sin, Sorrow and Dejection of Mind, Praise and Thanksgiving, Trust in God, Prayer and Supplication, Mercy and Pardon, are followed by quotations from the Old and New Testament adapted to the compiler's own use. Throughout the whole compilation there is evident a marked liturgical intention as well as a strong sense of spiritual need both personal and corporate. By it we are enabled to see into the innermost workings of Browne's spirit. It helps us, as nothing else does, to form for ourselves an estimate of the Bishop's character. In it we have laid bare the difficulties, the failings, the hopes and the aspirations of a true Father in God; and it is all the more valuable inasmuch as it was intended for his own use alone.

The good man's spirit passed to God on August 25, 1735. His remains now rest beneath the Cathedral Church of St. Fin Barre. Even in its alienation the sylvan retreat which he formed for himself and bequeathed to his successors still speaks of him. The Bishop's Walk, the Bishop's Well, the paved courtyard with the Mitre and his initials picked out in stone—all are still pointed out, but the little chapel in which he prayed is a cattle stall and the Shell House in which he wrote his *Divine Analogy* is a ruin. Change and chance have worked their havoc with much that once belonged to the Church Browne loved. Still she presses on her way. Still the memory and example of some of the fairest of the sons of God inspire and hearten her. Her heritage in the Saints is a rich and full one. She thanks God for such devoted sons as Peter Browne, whose gifts of head and heart were consecrated to Christ Jesus, and in whom we are made to see once more what the hallowing of the fact and function of the human intellect may lead to and what deep devotion to central truth and splendid diligence in duty may accomplish.

CHARLES A. WEBSTER (*Dean of Ross*).

---



## MISCELLANEA

### NOTES AND COMMENTS

AMONG contributors to the present issue, Mr. R. J. C. Gutteridge is a theological student at Cambridge who has recently spent several months in Germany. His careful and fully documented article is of special value at the present time, when it is more important to try to understand the new spirit in Germany than to hold up hands of horror over the breakdown at Geneva. The Rev. A. R. Bellars is Vicar of Warminster; and the Dean of Ross, Dr. Webster, is one of the foremost antiquaries in Ireland.

We have received a copy of the *Oxford Calendar and Lectionary* for 1934, compiled by Canon Dearmer. It is well got up, and follows an intelligible sequence of colours, though we are surprised to find that, while the revised Lectionary is adopted, the old Calendar is used as regards Holy Days. As to the revised Lectionary, we agree with the remark in the Preface that "although there are many great improvements in the last revision, the Lessons are often too long." But we should go further, and say that the simplicity of the arrangement which marked the old Lectionary was far too lightly discarded in the revision of 1922.

### CORRESPONDENCE

#### THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

DEAR SIR,

As I am honoured by a kindly criticism by the late Oriel Professor of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion, I feel that courtesy requires me to explain my allusion to Article XXVIII., which he says puzzles him. The only mention therein of "substance" is made (as he says) in explanation of Transubstantiation; but it is argued that this doctrine "overthroweth the nature of a sacrament." How so, then? The nature of a sacrament consisting, as it does, in nothing but the conjunction of a spiritual power with an evidence apparent to the senses of its presence and bestowal, transubstantiation can overthrow it only by destroying such perceptible evidence, since no one would suggest that it disposed of the spiritual power. Unless, however, the substance which, according to the doctrine, is changed be something apparent to the senses, the change of it into what is admittedly not apparent to the senses cannot reduce the sacrament to ruins. It seems, therefore, that the Article must be using the term substance in the popular meaning, as we say "a substantial thing," or if not quite that, then in a more or less equivocal way, as we speak of "a substantial gain" and not at all in the meaning of Trent in the word and dogma of Transubstantiation. So I venture to adhere to my original statement.

And I am so bold as still to think that Bishop Cosin is as confused as the Article. It is, no doubt, perfectly true, as the Professor puts it, that "we commonly infer the presence of a 'substance' from sensible appearances": we infer it scientifically, too, from the same data, because we see



those appearances change, while the object in question remains itself. But it is precisely because that underlying principle of identity and continuity is not apparent to the senses that it meets a logical need, for if it were, it would be subject to that same variability without which nothing can be perceptible by the senses; and thus we should have no explanation of the process of becoming. When, therefore, the great bishop says that "it appears to our senses that the substance of the Bread doth still remain whole and entire," I am forced to believe that he also is employing the term in a rough-and-ready, rather than in a philosophical, connotation.

The point is that "substance" is reached purely by inference, while the substances of ordinary talk are reached by perception. But you do not want a discussion on the *philosophia perennis*; and I almost fear that I have missed the real thought of Dr. Webb's brief letter, for all this is so familiar and commonplace.

Yours faithfully,  
A. B. W. WHATTON.

SIR,

Mr. Whatton has very courteously allowed me to see in advance his answer to my question in your August number, and I am thus enabled to subjoin to that answer the following note.

It appears to me that the statement in the Article about Transubstantiation overthrowing the nature of a Sacrament (which I had guessed was what Mr. Whatton really had in mind) does *not* depend upon a misunderstanding of the meaning of the word "substance" as used by scholastic theologians. Whatever may have been the case with Cosin, who wrote when scholastic terminology had to a great extent gone out of fashion in England, it would be, I am sure, a mistake to assume, without strong evidence, an elementary ignorance of the meaning of that terminology in the author of the Article, in whose time it must still have been more familiar than any other to theological scholars.

Whether one agrees or not (I do agree myself) with the Article in holding that Transubstantiation overthrows the nature of a Sacrament, the question surely turns upon a different point altogether. We may take it as admitted on both sides that "substance" is, as such, imperceptible by the senses and is distinguished from the "accidents" which are said to "inhere" in it. This is just as true of the "substance" of bread as of the "substance" of Christ's body. But, whereas in other Sacraments the sensible "accidents," *e.g.* of the water in Baptism, inhere in their proper substance of water, although by a divine ordinance the application of this substance with a certain formula conveys an inward spiritual grace, which, apart from that ordinance, it would not convey, in the Eucharist (according to the doctrine of Transubstantiation) the "accidents of bread" do not inhere in their proper substance of bread; for that has been "totally converted" into the substance of the body of Christ. This change would indeed be in itself imperceptible by the senses, since it is a change of one "substance" into another, not of "accidents" into other "accidents." But, if it has taken place, the question arises, What is that which affects our senses as the substance of bread commonly does? —or, in scholastic phraseology, in what substance do the accidents which are commonly those of bread inhere? Not, according to the accepted doctrine of Transubstantiation, in the substance of Christ's body. It is considered erroneous to suppose that the accidents of bread can inhere



in that most sacred substance; they must therefore be held to subsist, by a quite exceptional exercise of divine power, *without* a substance, in order that communicants and assistants may not be horrified and disgusted by perceiving the "accidents" proper to a human body offered to them as objects of sight and manducation. Now I should myself be prepared to hold, on philosophical grounds, that this assertion of the subsistence of "accidents" without a "substance" in which to inhere is really meaningless, as would be the assertion that God sometimes made the sides of a triangle to exist without angles. Of course, Roman Catholic theologians would be able to bring arguments to show that the cases are different, and I should have to argue that the differences between them are not such as to justify us in holding Transubstantiation to be in a sense miraculous indeed, but not contrary to reason, as would be the supposed treatment of a triangle. But the point at issue between them and me (and, I believe, between them and the author of the Article) is not that the author of the Article or I suppose, any more than they, that "substance" apart from "accidents" is perceptible by the senses, but that we should answer the question, "In what substance do the accidents of bread (and wine) inhere?" by saying, "In their proper substance (or substances)," and should affirm that to answer the question otherwise is to make the Eucharist essentially different from a "Sacrament," in which an outward sign—viz., "accidents" manifesting the presence of the "substance" in which such "accidents" naturally inhere, so that the presence of that substance can be regularly inferred from their presence—conveys a spiritual grace distinct from any effects which that "substance" would naturally produce. It is in this sense, I take it, that the doctrine of Transubstantiation was held by the author of the Article to "overthrow the nature of a Sacrament."

I think it unfortunate that the importance of the point which, if I am right, is at issue between our Reformers and their opponents upon this subject should be minimized by supposing it to turn upon a mere misunderstanding which, at the period in question, could hardly have passed muster, whatever may have been the case a century later. I should fully admit that this misunderstanding is really to be found in the celebrated criticism of the doctrine of Transubstantiation by Tillotson which Hume quoted with approval in his *Essay on Miracles*.

CLEMENT C. J. WEBB.

### VISITING

DEAR SIR,

What I feel about the "visiting problem" after an experience of many years in four parishes ranging from 30,000 to 12,000 in their population is, that but little effective can be done, whatever method is in use, until the laity are persuaded to change the angle from which they view the problem.

The majority of the laity persist in making no distinction between town and country parishes. Consequently, what they insist on having is a "visit from the parson." Visits from laity—even, in some cases, visits from curates—do not suffice, for the simple reason that "the parson is not doing his duty, he doesn't visit *us*."

The only remedy I can see is to instil, carefully, patiently and prayer-



fully, into the minds of the laity, that the duty is reciprocal—that is, it is as much the duty of the layman to know his parson as it is the duty of the parson to know his layman.

Once this was insisted on and made clear, the problem would admit of easy solution.

Yours truly,  
G. H. HARRIS.

9, HUNTINGDON ROAD,  
CAMBRIDGE.

September 29, 1933.

### NOTES ON PERIODICALS

*The British Museum Quarterly.* Vol. viii., No. 1.

The opening number of Volume VIII. of this valuable quarterly is packed full of interest, and is double the size of its predecessors. The frontispiece is a reproduction of a fine drawing in black chalk by Rubens, and looks like a study for a *Pietà*.

There are attractive illustrations from an Assamese manuscript showing scenes from the life of King Sib Singh, whose reign lasted from 1714 until 1744. More Sumerian antiquities are illustrated and described, amongst which, of special interest, is an early painted vase from Khasaji, with representations probably of the horse or mule; "in that case much that has been written about the introduction of the horse into Babylonia requires revision."

The Museum has recently become possessed of two new liturgical manuscripts, a fourteenth-century Ritual from the diocese of Châlons-sur-Marne, and a Book of Hours of the Sarum use belonging to the first quarter of the fifteenth century. Descriptions are given of both these manuscripts.

A note on the experimental use of infra-red photography to facilitate the reading of papyri tells us that while the results in connection with Egyptian hieratic documents have been disappointing, yet the results with Egyptian leather documents have proved highly successful.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester.* July, 1933.

Owing perhaps to the absence of the "Woodbrooke Studies" from this periodical there is not so much of theological interest in this number, though in other fields it is replete with scholarly articles. The first is contributed by Dr. S. Alexander on the difficult subject of "Value," one of his lectures delivered at the John Rylands Library earlier in the year. To speak of "value," he says, is "another way of expressing the fact that everything, directly or indirectly, closely or remotely, is connected with the whole of things . . . everything in the world has all the rest of the world for its field." The Professor has a tilt against Kant, who "set up a barren criterion of goodness," and against our "latter-day moralists" to whom right is right only by intuition. The idea of value, though judging things for their own sakes, never loses connection with practice. "Truth is truth because it satisfies curiosity in [a] refined and human form . . . humanized and systematic curiosity." Art, again, is *homo additus naturæ*, even as regards the beauties of nature; "we select



those elements of the natural object which suit our mood." Beauty is what satisfies an impulse of constructiveness which has become human and contemplative. Another interesting article gives an account of mediæval epistolary forms, *florida verborum venustas*, with some amusing examples. There is an essay by Mr. Wright Roberts on a manuscript of Dr. Burney, now lodged in the Rylands Library. This is a verse satire upon the "General History of the Science and Practice of Music," written by his rival, Sir John Hawkins, in 1776. Dr. Burney calls his poem "The Trial of Midas the Second." In some parts it is a little ill-natured, but the critical judgments of the late eighteenth century on matters of art are now to be read with amusement. But Mr. Roberts contends that, after all, Dr. Burney did not by this effusion tarnish his good fame as "a man for all the world to love," for he refrained from publishing it! The foregoing mentions only a few of the many learned papers which are included in this valuable publication.

W. R. V. BRADE.

---

*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses.* April, 1933.

Two of the principal articles in this number are devoted to a consideration of the doctrine of Mary as Co-redemptrix as that idea appears in Albert the Great and Liguori respectively. Of the two Doctors the earlier in date seems to have been the more extravagant in his expressions. Albert calls Mary *mediatrix, consors Redemptoris*, and so forth. He says in another place *filius non tenetur tantum exaudire sed obedire matri*. On the other hand, the term "Co-redemptrix," which is comparatively modern, is not found in the well-known "Glories of Mary" of Liguori. It seems to have its decided opponents in the Roman communion even at the present day. Heiler is, however, quoted to the effect that it has its roots in the Mariology of the fourth century.

A third article deals with the scholastic *infused moral virtues*. The ordinary moral virtues are *acquired* by the exercise of our natural capacities, but most scholastic authors hold that, in addition to these, there are moral virtues which God infuses into the soul and to which we could never attain by the ordinary human faculties. Such virtues, however, cannot prove their presence by our ordinary experience; they are withdrawn from the observation both of moral philosophy and of psychology. The learned author of this article suggests that we have here a piece of scholastic doctrine which has been introduced only for the sake of logical symmetry, just as the Gifts of the Spirit are limited to "seven" although no such limit is observed in Scripture.

There is also an interesting account of the disciplinary state of the various uniate Churches, based upon certain recent Roman publications which have been issued under the auspices of the Sacred Congregation for Eastern affairs as a preliminary to the proposed codification of their Canon Law, which would seem from the immense variety of sources involved to be a task of many years, and of considerable difficulty.

A number of interesting books are reviewed, including a new *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* and a treatise on Pauline eschatology.

W. R. V. BRADE.

---



*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses.* July, 1933.

This number contains several articles of interest. It begins with a study on scholastic lines of the notion of "Person" in St. Thomas: in what sense and why is the Humanity assumed by Christ said to be impersonal, and if the Divine Word had been withdrawn, would it have been impersonal then? The article is written by a missionary priest in China. A Latin article follows on "the adoption of sons," *filiatio adoptiva*. There is also a short but very interesting note on the bodily Assumption of our Lady, by Fr. A. Janssens. The difficulties in the way of considering this belief as part of the Apostolic Deposit are pointed out. Although "generally held by the faithful," the theologians have no easy task in showing that it necessarily follows from the known content of Revelation. If it is suggested that it must have been known and taught by St. John and other Apostles, how can we explain the patristic uncertainty about it, and indeed the complete ignorance of the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries? A thoughtful article on the Liturgy as "an end in itself" follows this. As God and the Beatific Vision are the only complete and final "ends in themselves," the concepts of finality and utility are by no means mutually exclusive in reference to any subordinate "ends." Even the Sacraments are *means* of grace. Such ideas as "art for art's sake" are quite out of place in the Catholic Church. Among the reviews of books is one by Fr. Janssens on a work by Fr. G. Coolen, entitled *L'Anglicanisme d'Aujourd'hui*. The reviewer protests against a certain lack of seriousness in the author on certain points, and also to his statement that "in some dioceses the intellectual level of the Anglican clergy is very low." He points out that this could be said, *e.g.*, of the clergy of the Philippine Islands, and that in general it is not true; "the average Anglican clergyman has a considerable intellectual culture," he knows his Bible and biblical theology, the history of institutions and dogma; what he does not know is *la théologie catholique*, just indeed as French or Belgian priests are ignorant of Protestant doctrines. There are, as usual, many other interesting reviews.

W. R. V. BRADE.



## REVIEWS

PRIESTHOOD AND PRAYER. By the Rev. Father Bede Frost, O.S.B. A. R. Mowbray and Co. 7s. 6d.

The subject of this book is of fundamental importance to every priest, for it is nothing less than the true nature of Christian priesthood. Many of us realize that for a priest to be a good priest a knowledge of his craft is a primary necessity, and so do our best to master at any rate the outlines of those branches of theology which help us to that end; some of us, too (perhaps more than Father Bede Frost seems inclined to think), have discovered the even greater necessity of prayer, and so give ourselves as well as we can to the living of the spiritual life: but perhaps comparatively few have stopped to ask the question this book would make us face—What is my priesthood? What am I? Now, if Father Bede Frost makes us face that question he has done us a great service, quite apart from any guidance he may give with regard to our answering of it; for what we are comes before what we do, and it is of little use learning to do priestly acts before we have grasped the true nature of that priesthood whose functions we are called to exercise.

It may, of course, be objected that we already know all about this subject, and that it is this very knowledge which has transformed the country parson of Jane Austen into that of Sheila Kaye-Smith. That the vision of true priesthood has largely transformed the Anglican clergy one is not concerned to deny, but that is not the same thing as affirming either that we are perfect (which we are called to be) or that we have yet plumbed to their depths the vital truths of our priesthood. The book before us goes to the very heart of the matter, and experience gained in conducting retreats for clergy leads one to believe that the author's teaching, or at any rate some of it, may reveal to many readers truths hitherto unrealized. Not that Father Bede Frost's teaching is new: he works, for the most part, the rich mine of Catholic teaching, and some readers might consider that his *flair* for quotation almost amounts to a disease; he is least satisfactory when he essays a canter on some personal hobby-horse.

The purpose and scope of the book must be explained in the author's own words: "I have endeavoured," he says, "first, to insist upon the true nature of Christian priesthood as essentially one with the Priesthood of our Lord; secondly, to show the implications and meaning of that Priesthood as exercised by



those who have been called to continue it upon earth. Thirdly, to point out that the whole value of the apostolate of souls depends upon and flows from the priest's union with his Divine Master. . . . Fourthly, to emphasize the need not only of prayer, but of seeing the fact that prayer must be progressive, tending toward some degree of contemplation. The later chapters should be regarded as a continuation of what has already been said in my *Art of Mental Prayer*."

In his first chapter Father Bede Frost recalls us well and wisely to the necessity of sanctity for the priest. No doubt we deserve much of the castigation which in this chapter and in other parts of the book the author metes out with no light hand, but much of his criticism would have more force if it were less sweeping and rhetorical, more balanced and detailed. Criticism is good when used with calmness and precision, but loses much of its effect when it becomes a general denunciation, as it sometimes does here.

The next four chapters are the foundation of the whole book, and may well show to many readers a point of view which they have not realized before. They answer the question of which we have written above and deal with the fundamental character of priesthood in relation to the will of God and the divine order of creation, showing it not as a merely human or even ecclesiastical thing but as a participation in the eternal priesthood of our Lord. The chapter on "the relations of the priest to the Holy Trinity" is particularly valuable in showing what our unity with Jesus involves, but there are two questionable expressions in the early part of it which call for some comment. In speaking of the priest's relation to God the Father, our author says: "A son of God, he is now raised to a participation in the Divine Fatherhood, 'from whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named'; he is a 'father' by his *sharing both in the eternal act by which God is ever Father, the generation of His Word*, and by begetting children of God in Holy Baptism, together with the paternal care with which he watches over, guides, prays for them, and administers to them the Bread of Life" (p. 59). The bulk of this sentence is, of course, entirely true, but the words which we have italicized are gravely misleading, for no creature can share in the generation of the eternal Word.

The other statement is this: "Like St. Joseph, the priest bears, *rules over*, cares for Jesus, in the Holy Sacrament and in souls" (p. 60) (italics ours). It is true that the priest is the guardian of the Blessed Sacrament and the souls committed to him, but he is not the guardian of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, nor can he rule over his Master from whom his very priesthood is derived. To say that our Lord gives His priests



share in His own priesthood is one thing, to suggest that this gives them an authority separate from His own, quite another, and we find it hard to believe that these statements really represent the mind of our author.

After theology come the practical considerations which flow therefrom. The chapter on the Priest's Rule of Life contains much wise counsel and two of the author's foibles. In the first place, he refuses to allow that meditation can fruitfully be made at any other time than the morning in spite of a quotation from Cardinal Bourne in an opposite sense; in the second place, after a wise distinction between recreation and idleness, he practically refuses the priest any recreation at all. One gathers that priests should work sixteen or seventeen hours a day and have no days off, the latter on the ground that the Catholic laity have none, which is not quite true (the case mentioned by Mother Janet Stuart is an exceptional one which evidently caused her some surprise, and not, as our author would suggest, normal). A strict rule of life is, indeed, a necessity to the priestly life, but we are not all devoted to idleness, and one fears that the hard-worked priest who takes his vocation seriously, and so is most likely to read this book, may either ruin his health or give up in despair if he attempts to do all that Father Bede Frost expects of him. Nevertheless most of this chapter is excellent, and the next contains a much-needed exhortation to the devout study of Holy Scripture.

The last chapters are concerned with prayer. Our author points out that it is not enough for the priest merely to say prayers: he must lead the prayer life, progressing under the guidance of the Holy Spirit towards some degree of contemplation. "The heart of priesthood is none other than the heart of Jesus in its constant attitude towards His Eternal Father, the attitude of adoring, contemplating, desiring prayer," which prayer alone gives life to his activities. Father Bede Frost shows clearly what contemplation is and its relation to action, its fruits, and the way which leads from the lower stages of prayer to the higher; thus providing us with a map of the spiritual life which should be really valuable. These chapters form a useful and necessary continuation of the *Art of Mental Prayer*. The priest's prayer should normally tend to become increasingly contemplative, but that does not mean that all priests will attain to the same kind or degree of contemplation, and our author does us good service in pointing out how wide the term is. He seems, however, to assume that we shall pass through the Dark Night of the Spirit as a matter of course, a suggestion which is borne out neither by experience nor the teaching of St. John of the Cross, who expressly says, "The



night of sense is common and the lot of many . . . the spiritual night is the portion of very few" (*The Dark Night*, Book I., cap. viii.). Advance in prayer is not automatic; the wonders of infused prayer are granted by God to those deeply mortified souls who are able to sustain the trials of the night of the spirit, but not all of us reach that point in this life, though we should all strive to be worthy to do so.

Father Bede Frost's exposition would have been more valuable even than it is if he had dealt with the matter of aridity, to which he certainly alludes but leaves it at that. It is good, by enlarging on the glories of prayer, to encourage priests to seek the heights and refuse to be satisfied with the mediocre; but the way is not all glorious, and we need counsel concerning those long periods of dryness which many of us know so well, when none of the beauties of chapter xi. seem to be present or even attainable and one seems to be lost in the wilderness out of the way.

One curious error occurs in these chapters: Ruysbroek is twice referred to as "the greatest of German mystics"—but he was a Fleming.

We heartily commend this book to the thoughtful attention of the clergy. Good books on the priesthood are scarce and few so penetrating as this; it should do much to draw us nearer to the great High Priest of our profession.

F. P. HARTON.

---

SCIENTIFIC THEORY AND RELIGION. The World Described by Science and its Spiritual Interpretation. By Ernest William Barnes, Bishop of Birmingham. The Gifford Lectures at Aberdeen, 1927-1929. Cambridge University Press. 25s.

The author tells us in his foreword that in this book the original lectures have been extensively revised and have benefited by the inclusion of some recent developments of knowledge. The magnificent idea of giving a comprehensive picture of the knowledge attained by modern Science and then not merely of reconciling the knowledge with the spiritual claims of Religion but showing the true unity of all knowledge and experience, is one which commands our respect and admiration, whatever criticisms of its actual execution in this book we may be moved to make. The witness of one conversant with the current achievements of Science who, standing in the faith that the Universe is a *Uni*-verse with no ultimate dualism, is not afraid to face the consequences of this conviction, will not be without its effect at a time when in some circles a shrug, a smile, and a



remark about the subconscious is deemed a sufficient refutation of Theism.

The book falls naturally into three parts. In the first eleven chapters the whole scheme of Physics is developed. The second part, which contains the next five chapters, deals with the development of life from its origin in the Geological environment through the stages of evolution to man. In the last four chapters the metaphysical and theological implications of the earlier parts of the book are discussed.

In considering the first part of the book, our chief criticism is that the author underrates the present lack of familiarity with the nomenclature and modes of thought in the exact sciences. In the introduction (on p. 6) we are told that "these lectures are intended for educated men and women who have no technical knowledge of science or philosophy": yet in the first 200 pages we find quite an elaborate discussion of Riemann's theory of space and its application to the mathematical theory of relativity—a discussion which, among other merits, can hardly claim that of being untechnical. It is to be feared that the explanations at the beginning of Chapter V. intended for the "plain man" will fall on deaf ears: in all probability the "plain man" after reaching p. 35 has skipped the next 400 pages: which is a pity, because there is much in the early chapters well worth the attention of the reader who knows little of the ordinary calculus let alone the tensor calculus. We are not yet past the age when the only "education for a gentleman" was a classical one. The majority of well-educated men and women have little knowledge of mathematics: and while sympathizing with the author's protest against this achievement of education we must recognize this state of things as a regrettable fact. As it is, the early chapters can only be read properly by those who are conversant with the mathematics of relativity and electrical theory, and who may not wish to read again what they have already read in the original works of Eddington, Minkowski, Lorentz, Dirac and others. It also seems a pity that the author quite deliberately omitted any but the slightest discussion of the Electro-magnetic theory. This, one of the most elegant pieces of thought, could have been the subject of treatment more suited to the general reader than is the case with much which does find place in the book. And it would have been better for the general purposes of the book if the detailed analysis of the early chapters had been placed in an appendix or omitted altogether, its place being taken by a more uniform and comprehensive descriptive review of physical and chemical theory on the general lines of Chapter VIII.

Among smaller matters, there is a childish footnote (on



p. 35) which is unworthy both of the author and the subject with which he deals. There is a slip near the foot of p. 258: waves of heat radiation are of course *longer* and not *shorter* than those of visible light. Incidentally the whole paragraph, "Radiation and Human Sight," is a very interesting discussion of the connection of the limits of vision and the evolution of animal forms. On p. 310 is a timely warning to the over-enthusiastic pseudo-scientific theologian: energy is no more spiritual than matter. The first part of the book ends (on p. 408) with a good paragraph on the relation of Theism to physical theory.

Little in the second part of the book calls for remark in connection with its scientific content. The section as a whole is very readable. But a criticism which was not entirely absent during the consideration of the earlier chapters becomes quite definite in these five later chapters. Nothing spoils what is intended to be a dispassionate scientific discussion more than the continual irruption of the author's prejudices, particularly when these are not ultimately scientific, but metaphysical, theological, or merely personal and æsthetic. For instance, we grow rather tired of the contrast (implied or expressed) between the "evasive phrases which are too common in modern theology" and the singleness of mind of the man of science. Even our author (as a man of science) gives some cause to doubt the exclusive nature of this contrast. In connection with the remark at the beginning of the chapter on the Solar System, it would be interesting to know where in "the Christian creeds" belief in either a flat or fixed earth is expressed. Or again, on p. 457, in the quite reverent consideration of the Virgin Birth in the light of biology, the statement that "they"—the introductory narratives of Matthew and Luke—"reflect, as do New Testament narratives in general, the outlook of a community which had not realized the invariable character of those natural sequences which form the 'laws of Nature' investigated by the modern man of science," contrasts (unfavourably to the author) with the clear recognition (on p. 518) of genetic variations in biology which cut clean across natural sequences, or with the remark (on p. 281) in connection with the theoretical inconsistencies of the Quantum Theory. "Until recently it seemed as though all that we could do was to hold fast to two ends of a chain of which the intervening links were hidden from us. Such a mode of proceeding Poincaré, a little unkindly, described as being characteristic of 'the embarrassed theologian'"—a procedure which did not seem to incur the disapproval or scorn of our author.

The attempt to mix science and metaphysics results in a product which is of doubtful value and which certainly is not



science, and ought to be relegated to the metaphysical section of the book.

On p. 547 there is an unnecessary and none too pleasant reference to the Roman Church.

The last section of the book begins with a general discussion of metaphysical questions and passes on to belief in God, religious experience, and finally immortality and the conclusion. This part of the book is of uneven value. There are some fine pieces of thought and some poor ones. The discussion of the arguments for the existence of God (pp. 590-608) is a good summary of the best thought on the subject, and the chapter on immortality is very sensibly written: in both there is a sane and unemotional style which is well suited to the peculiar difficulties of the subjects considered.

Chapter IX. (Religious Experience) contains items well below the level of the rest of the book and much that is inconsistent with matter in this and in other chapters. There seems to be a complete misunderstanding of a current use of the term *supernatural*: the author's often expressed objections to "traditional Christianity" and Catholicism arise both from a right abhorrence of any "ultimate dualism" in thought, and from a mistaken idea that what he calls (on p. 589) "the Catholic dualism of natural and supernatural" is anything more than a matter of nomenclature. The distinction in description between natural and supernatural is no more unjustified than that which the author makes (on p. 563) between the physical and the psychical or (on p. 589) where he says, "In that domain of science"—biological evolution—"there exist law *and* development, uniformity *and* freedom; and they form a system in which there is, as it seems to me, an inner unity" (author's italics). On similar grounds the distinction between natural and supernatural is valid as expressing the distinction between those natural sequences which "the man of science picks from the apparent chaos of Nature" (p. 569) and the realm of efficient cause which lies behind them. To say that a given event seems to be of supernatural origin is to say what can be said of every event, but which is appropriate in a particular case which, falling outside the current knowledge of natural sequences, reminds us that our knowledge of these is imperfect and that "laws of nature are descriptions of uniform sequences: they are not self-existent and no inherent necessity attaches to them" (p. 568). Nothing is more opposed to the method and spirit of science than to say that our knowledge of regular sequences in nature renders impossible the occurrence of events irreconcilable with the knowledge. If such events are alleged to occur, we must consider them on their merits and be prepared to re-



adjust our formulation of the "laws of Nature." There is no question of dualism, or of an irrationality in the Will of God: there may be a premature "rationalism" in our own thought. It is surprising in this connection that the author makes no reference to the work of Dr. F. R. Tennant, who deals at length with this question.

In his discussion of the relation of religious experience and dogmatic assertion (p. 633), the author seems a little infelicitous in his use of the word *dogma*, which here, apparently, is confined to *religious* thought only. The "dry light of reason" might well be applied to several dogmatically stated (but unproved) assertions in the book: the usual remarks about inanimate matter and spiritual presences: the frequent application of epithets (retrograde, degenerate, pagan, etc.) to beliefs and modes of thought unacceptable to the author: or the assertion as to the change of "the faith of St. Paul into catholicism," concerning which the author has to admit (p. 631) "that detailed evidence is not as full as we could wish."

When we turn to consider the discussion of the Sacraments we find what unfortunately we have been led to expect from the author—a complete absence of any attempt to understand those with whom he is unhappily at issue. Thus (on p. 573) we find, "But that a spiritual presence should appear in, or instead of the 'substance' of, an inanimate material object as the result of certain acts and words of a priest is incredible. Naturally, every experimental test [a footnote states 'Such tests must, of course, be psychological and not chemical'] fails to reveal it." Ignoring the misrepresentations in this statement, and the question of change of substance, we will let the author himself answer for us.

On p. 592:

"There is the promise of life and even potential consciousness in inanimate matter, because such matter exists in and for God, and because the kind of use which He would make of it was immanent in it when it began to be. Without Him it would have been nothing: all its properties and potentialities are from Him and it is His Spirit which gives them actuality. The origin of matter, like the cause of events, is the will of God."

And as to psychological tests we may quote words from a paragraph (on p. 613) which is well worth reading:

"Yet who can prove the reality of spiritual grace? If at times we think that we can see its effect in the lives of men, and if then its fruit is of great excellence, we must be content."

There is no liberally minded Catholic who is not content that thoughts such as these should form part of the basis of his faith.



There is no reference whatever in this book to the work of Whitehead or A. E. Taylor, which as well as that of Tennant (already mentioned) is relevant to its theme. One cannot but feel that the author, by permitting his energy to be diverted into the paths of controversy, has lost a very great opportunity.

C. D. WADDAMS.

## NOTICES

LE CORPS MYSTIQUE DU CHRIST. Emil Mersch, S.J. Louvain. Museum Lessianum. 2 Tomes. Fr. 90.

Professor Mersch's learned book is of particular value to scholars at a time when Christendom is no longer content to acquiesce in the prolongation *sine die* of its unhappy divisions. The revival in the Anglican Communion of a belief in the supernatural functions of the Church, and in its character as the divinely appointed means to the union of mankind with God, is a permanent and indisputable achievement of the Oxford Movement. But the revival of this belief has spread far beyond Anglican borders. Protestant bodies, both English-speaking and Continental, are giving a new emphasis today to the idea of the Church as the Body of Christ. And this emphasis lies behind all serious attempts to achieve the reunion of Christendom. Questions which have been raised as to the validity of St. Paul's or St. John's interpretations of their Master's teaching have done little to check the reaffirmation of the central doctrine which they share—the unity and solidarity of the disciples of Christ. The Church—however that term be defined—is once again regarded as the Mystical Body of Christ, which continues His life and work upon earth until his coming again.

This book traces the development of this conception in Scripture, in the Eastern Fathers, and in the theologians of the West. The author is careful to show that the teaching of St. Paul and St. John is foreshadowed in the Old Testament, and adumbrated in the Synoptic record of our Lord's preaching of the Kingdom. In the grand Pauline conception of our mystical inclusion in Christ, and in the parallel Johannine teaching that Christians are united with God and united among themselves through their possession of the life of Christ, the doctrine of the Mystical Body is formulated. Perhaps the most striking fact about this doctrine is the richness of its content at its first formulation. Later writers, as the study of the latter sections of the book suggests to the reader, have little of value to add or to make explicit.

This does not mean that the study of the later exponents of this doctrine is useless. The chief interest of the two latter sections of the book lies, however, in the history of the use of this doctrine as a polemical weapon. St. Paul, indeed, had found the indivisibility of the mystical Christ an effective argument against the wars of ecclesiastical partisans at Corinth. And the doctrine of the Mystical Body is used in turn to refute the errors of Gnosticism, Arianism, Donatism, Pelagianism, and sixteenth-century Protestantism. Indeed, the author suggests its value as an antidote to Modernism.

In early times the doctrine commended itself to Eastern rather than Western writers; and the study of its Western developments leaves the



impression that the conception of the Mystical Body was never wholly congenial to the legalistic outlook of the Latin races. It was largely neglected by the Scholastics, having little appeal to them; and hence the doctrine is associated, both in Catholic and Protestant writings, with a pessimistic view of human nature. Augustine made large use of the ideas connected with it in his controversy against Pelagius. Taking as his standpoint the doctrine of the two Adams (on which Irenæus and Hilary of Poitiers had founded their teaching upon the Mystical Body consisting of those who were incorporated in the second Adam), Augustine formulated the ideas of the solidarity of evil and of good in the world. Mankind were mystically included either in the fallen Adam, and therefore subject to original sin, or in Christ the second Adam, and therefore subject to Grace. Hence while a high view may be taken of the potentialities of those who through the Sacraments of the Church are united with the human perfection of Christ, who is one in substance with the Word of God, the rest of mankind is saturated with evil, since all mankind partakes in the sinfulness of fallen Adam. Hence a low view is taken of human nature, and there arises the Protestant doctrine of the Mystical Body with its depreciation of the redeeming power of the human nature of Christ, and the quietist and rigorist doctrines of the French school of the seventeenth century. To writers of the latter class, human nature is a source of "horror" to God and to the souls whom He has enlightened. Complete abnegation of human personality becomes the *summum bonum*.

There follows, however, a reaction from this pessimism. Cardinal Pie, while combating the error of naturalism, that human nature is self-sufficient, maintains that in Jesus Christ human nature is deified, and that this deification extends over all creation. Christ's earthly life is prolonged, first in the Church, secondly in all mankind, and thirdly in the whole of creation including the material universe. "*Le divin Adolescent de Nazareth . . . grandit encore sur la terre.*" This is to some extent a return to the Eastern doctrine as stated by Irenæus, who follows closely the ideas of the epistles of the Captivity. In Christ the whole of creation is summed up and contained; and the Church is the *pleroma* of Christ, effecting in Him the deification of mankind.

In recent days Roman Catholic theologians have paid particular attention to this doctrine. The Schema *De Ecclesia*, submitted at the Vatican Council, makes the character of the Mystical Body of Christ the essence of the Church. The Encyclical *Miserentissimus Redemptor* of the present Pope again emphasizes the doctrine.

The conception of the Mystical Body, from its Pauline formulation onwards, is essential to the sacramentalist or Catholic religious system. It is a necessary corollary to the doctrine of the Eucharist, it is the basis of the doctrine of the Communion of Saints, with its devotional implications. It must lie behind every justifiable attempt on the part of the Church to exercise discipline over its members; and, as we have said, it is likely to be the motive power which eventually will achieve the reunion of Christendom. At the present moment study of this doctrine is necessary in relation to the problems of the visible unity of the Church and the seat of ecclesiastical authority. From the non-Roman point of view it may be urged that the Papal system gains little support from this doctrine. Whatever unity the members of the Mystical Body possess they derive from their union with Christ their Head, rather than from allegiance to any earthly ruler of the Church. The visible and efficacious signs of



the unity of the Body are to be found in the participation by its members in the Sacraments ordained by Him as means of union with Himself. Through the Sacraments of the Church, all members of the Body have a share in the life and spirit of Him who is the Word and Wisdom of God. And therefore we may also urge that ultimate doctrinal authority—however its decisions may be promulgated—must lie not in the findings of theological experts, nor in the “living voice” of prelates, but in the *consensus fidelium*, in the agreement of all the members of the Body, all who through their sacramental union with the Wisdom of God partake in the divine knowledge.

HUMPHREY BEEVOR.

MEISTER ECKHART'S SERMONS. Translated into English by Claud Field. Allenson. 2s.

Seven sermons by the German Dominican, 1260-1327, who has been called “the Father of German Thought.” It is difficult to discover the reason for this edition. It is not for the scholar, nor are the sermons likely to attract a reader to further exploration of Eckhart. Their devotional value is not apparent. Nor are they especially illustrative of the preacher's thought. They reveal chiefly the extreme tediousness of the Scholastic method of argument. Nothing is told us about the sermons, whether they are specimens of popular pulpit eloquence of that age, or whether they were addressed to a cloistered audience. The translation seems to be correct, but is colourless and undistinguished.

V. I. RUFFER.

THE KING'S GUESTS: A STRANGE FORMOSAN FELLOWSHIP. By Campbell N. Moody, D.D. Allenson. 3s. 6d.

A disjointed and scrappy account of certain Formosan converts to Protestantism. A real and descriptive account of missionary work in Formosa could be intensely interesting, but here the descriptions are far too often colourless, and the stories of conversion are of a wearying sameness. There are only two, incidental, mentions of Baptism, none at all of the power of sacramental grace. Worship seems to consist of hymn-singing. The strangest part of the book is the Appendix. Starting from the disturbing fact that while the Formosans are ready to worship God the Creator, they are quite uninterested in our Lord, Dr. Moody proceeds to a series of astoundingly inadequate judgments of various phases of Christian history and experience. He seems incapable of realizing that there are differences of temperament, let alone of vocation.

V. I. RUFFER.

JOHN WESLEY AND THE C18. A Study of his Social and Political Influence. By Maldwyn Edwards. Allen and Unwin. 6s.

Wesley and Methodism viewed from an unusual angle. But one cannot help feeling that the thesis would have been better as part of a much larger work dealing with other aspects as well. By itself it cannot help appearing one-sided and disproportioned. But it is a study which has not been adequately attempted before, and that makes one wish all the more that the author were less given to unsound and even contradictory argument. It is not easy to discover his final judgment. A great deal of not always fair criticism of Wesley is allied with a tendency to belittle and misjudge matters and movements outside Methodism. The



desire to be historically impartial is evident, but it is by no means invariably fulfilled. The author blandly assumes that democracy can do no wrong, and also that to bring any moral considerations into politics is a mistake that almost amounts to a crime. The style is readable, but one would prefer "point of view" to the constant "viewpoint."

V. I. RUFFER.

PRIÈRES D'UN CROYANT. By Marcel Légaut. Préface de S.E. le Cardinal Verdier. Bernard Grasset. Fr. 15.

This is one of a series of spiritual books entitled *La Vie Chrétienne*. The author is a lay professor at the University of Rennes, and the chapters of the book consist of addresses originally given to certain groups in the University. They certainly deserve the wider publicity now given to them. In the words of the Cardinal Archbishop in his Preface, addressed to the author, on every page "on est saisi par la sincérité qui donne à votre foi le caractère d'une réalité vécue." The arrangement of the meditations is intended to correspond with the normal stages of spiritual development: first the gladness of the dawn, then the first testing time of spiritual struggle, then the discovery of Christ Himself even in the very fact of trial, and finally, for the detached and mortified soul, the recognition that all the circumstances of life are consecrated by the presence of Christ. A work of great beauty which might provide "spiritual reading" for many weeks.

K. D. MACKENZIE.

WITH ALL THY MIND. A Study in the Relation of Doctrine to Experience. By Norman Goodall. Student Christian Movement. 3s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.

This is a book made up out of addresses delivered to students by a layman (at least in the sense that his name is not in Crockford: the reviewer has no means of knowing whether or not he is a minister of religion). But there the resemblance ceases. M. Légaut's book, as its name implies, is addressed to the believer, though indeed, as the Cardinal suggests, it might bring light to those who are still seeking it. Mr. Goodall deliberately addresses himself to those who find faith difficult, with the object of making them acknowledge that there is something in theology after all. He shows that in spite of the divergences of theologians there is a certain body of doctrine on the central truths of the faith which deserves to be called a classical tradition: and he believes that this can and ought to be presented in a way which will not offend the modern mind. The spiritual pilgrimage is not, he says, only a matter of personal hungers and satisfactions, but "also includes the exploration of an objective realm of truth in which the self finds deliverance from preoccupation with its own ends and learns to wonder, love and praise." The author himself believes in "the need for a more thorough theological reconstruction than has yet been accomplished," and his tendency is all towards simplification. He does not profess to provide an adequate theology. But he has written a thoughtful and stimulating book, which ought to suggest to his readers that there is a real interaction between dogma and faith on the one hand, and between dogma and prayer on the other.

K. D. MACKENZIE.